

OHIO

Norman S. McConnell, Berlin Center, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 John W. Turner, Bettsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 George M. Schmidt, Carroll, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Joseph A. Link, Carthage, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Stella G. Cleaver, Clarksville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.
 Fred Reichelderfer, Cridersville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 George F. Burford, Farmdale, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Everett Vine, Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of F. A. Loomis, transferred.
 Cora O. Shick, Huntsville, Ohio, in place of J. C. Wyllie, resigned.
 Iva D. Bachtel, Lagrange, Ohio, in place of A. L. Wyllner, resigned.
 Blanche M. Watkins, Lower Salem, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Howard H. Lesh, Middlebranch, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Robert H. Gano, Newport, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Jessie Dell, North Bend, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lesta C. Murphy, Rogers, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Barton F. Truster, Seven Mile, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Laura W. Spellman, Williamsfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

James E. Ward, Camargo, Okla., in place of Frank Ferguson, not commissioned.
 Erma E. Johnston, Gore, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Frank James, Hartshorne, Okla., in place of C. M. Surry, resigned.

OREGON

Lois M. Brown, Langlois, Oreg., in place of E. W. Black, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Anna J. Spisak, Dixonville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Ethel M. Goodwin, Folsom, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
 Olive M. Harkness, Gillett, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Clara V. Snyder, Glenmoore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Carl Seyler, Luthersburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Alexander Bubel, Middleport, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 William L. Doebler, Mifflinburg, Pa., in place of S. B. Miller, deceased.
 Lena C. Beers, North Bessemer, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Luther L. Hadden, Duncan, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

James A. Hudson, Brownsville, Tenn., in place of H. S. Dupree, deceased.
 Harry B. Gillespie, Limestone, Tenn., in place of A. K. Broyles, transferred.
 Bertha M. Cooper, Powell Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Gladys B. Kyle, Rogersville, Tenn., in place of K. P. Hale, deceased.
 John V. Kendall, Troy, Tenn., in place of J. O. Bennett, deceased.

TEXAS

Vera B. Elkin, Channing, Tex., in place of A. J. Denman, resigned.
 Charlie B. O'Bryan, De Berry, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Ollie Elaine Burditt, La Ward, Tex., in place of A. L. Burditt, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Robert H. Bear, Churchville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LXXXIX—659

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this hour of tumult and tempest, of temptation and trial, we rejoice that the Christ is our peace. In Him is our fortress and high tower and through faith we look forward to a time when wisdom shall be justified upon the earth and the dreams of the nations shall come true and shape the whole world again.

In the countless cross-currents of life give us to understand that right is right and never yet was expediency the wise rule for man or nation. We praise Thee that life is too great, too solemn and holy to be spent on anything but the things which abide. May the blessed Lord reign and guide our leaders that righteous peace may emerge out of chaos and confusion and lay again the foundations of free government. We pray that our country may not be a victim of that prosperity which ultimately causes discontent and begets the folly of extravagance. Lead our people to conduct themselves wisely and think of their surplus as another's need. Because Thou hast given us this wonderful land, dowered it with many gifts of rich abundance, and because of our sacred duty to sacrifice for the help of the whole world, O spirit of our Master, inspire us to toil and save unsparingly for the future federation of mankind. In the name of the Man of Galilee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt in his longest message to Congress discussed the question of subsidies and what they meant to the American housewife. His message was heard by the Congress but apparently not taken very seriously, at least not by a great many Members who were more anxious to please the interests opposed to subsidies than to follow the constructive leadership of our great Commander in Chief.

It has taken the women of the country a long time to understand the relation-

ship of subsidies to the cost of living. May I say that it is the first time women have felt that they were directly affected by a subsidy. Judging from the thousands of letters and telegrams received by me, and I have no doubt by many other Members of the House, during the past week, they find it difficult, very, very difficult, to understand why subsidies are paid for everything important to win the war except the most important thing of all, food. They are aroused as never before, because they see in the attempt to kill the food subsidies a threat to the American home, and this at a time when their husbands and sons are fighting and dying to protect their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have always hoped for an issue which would unite the women of America and also would permit them to know what great power and strength they have, and here it is.

The housewives of America are the practical economists of the home front. They are not interested in selfish lobbies but they are fast learning how lobbies and pressure groups function. I predict the lesson they are learning will make them realize their potential power and how to use it most effectively. One woman writes me:

Is it wrong to subsidize milk—the prime necessity to children—and right to subsidize cotton to the tune of a billion and a quarter dollars?

The League of Women Voters, a national nonpartisan organization, is doing a very constructive job in teaching women the use of the ballot. This organization is on record in favor of food subsidies. Also listed in favor are the American Association of University Women; the American Home Economics Association; the New Jersey Y. W. C. A.; the National Consumers League; the National Council of Negro Women; The National Federation of Settlements; and the League of Women Shoppers—also many labor organizations and church groups—all of which proves that when the American home is threatened, women can be depended on to protect it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Brooklyn Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF MEAT

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the following bill:

A bill to provide for the suspension of the point-rationing system with respect to meat for 60 days

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law or any regulation promulgated by any Government agency, no ration points shall be required to be used in connection with the purchase, sale, transfer, or other acquisition or disposition of meat during the period of 60 days immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this matter is one that deserves the earliest and most serious consideration of the Members of this House. Thousands of pounds of meat are spoiling due to the O. P. A. point-rationing system. Millions of pounds of beef and pork on the hoof that are ready for market are consuming feed which the farmers had intended to use to produce meat next year.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO 3

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of Committee on Elections No. 3, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose because a bill will be read for amendment this afternoon. The committee may sit during the general debate this afternoon, however, if the gentleman desires to submit that request.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a news item and two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that the leadership bring to the consideration of Congress legislation that will, first, give to the men and women of our fighting units the right to vote; and, second, legislation that will give a cash payment at the time of their discharge.

The legislation relative to voting should allow them the franchise with a mini-

mum of red tape and trouble. Since they are fighting to save our country, they want to vote to save our country.

Thousands of men are being discharged practically penniless. Let us give them immediate financial assistance to help them get readjusted to civilian life. These are obligations that we cannot conscientiously postpone any longer.

Let us give the veterans a real Christmas present by the passage of these two bills.

SUBSIDIES A TANGLED NET

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the statement of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], who has just preceded me, that at last the women of the United States were united on an issue in favor of food or consumer subsidies. It is apparent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey was not informed of the statement from the largest consumer area in the United States which refutes her allegation.

I want to read to the House a statement of the New York Federation of Women's Clubs on this same subject. It appeared in the December 3 issue of the Orion Review, a weekly paper published at Orion, Oakland County, Mich. It is entitled "A Bitter Lesson":

Subsidies are the tangled net in which a free people become so enmeshed that they become helpless pawns of a dominating centralized government. Farmers have learned that they who control the finance of farmers' business, control the farmers' liberty, and freedom of action. Farmers have learned this through experience with the misdirected government activities in recent years, sorrowful experience with the arbitrary, autocratic exercise of power by Government administrative agencies. Subsidies, given with the idea of encouraging production, defeat and destroy much of the incentive that should come with increased returns because farmers fear the government domination that accompanies subsidy payments.

This is signed by the New York Federation of Women's Clubs. It calls for sober thinking and challenges the attention of those who have been swept away by a wave of hysteria created by newspaper accounts and radio commentators, based on the false premise that the Government supports the people instead of the people supporting the Government.

RAILWAY WORKERS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last night War Mobilization Director James Byrnes, the Assistant President, with his offices in the White House,

made a Nation-wide radio address. In this address he pleaded for national unity behind administration hold-the-line policies and at the same time charged American railway workers with "pointing a pistol" at the head of Uncle Sam to obtain wage increases by threat of strike.

I agree with most of what Byrnes said about the need for holding the line against inflation. I only wish the administration had recognized this need sooner and practiced what it preached. However, neither unity can be served nor the line held by charging 1,500,000 of America's most patriotic citizens with assault with intent to kill or with armed robbery. The greatest thing the administration could do to promote home-front unity would be to quit accusing anyone who does not agree with it as being guilty of various high crimes and misdemeanors.

What are the real facts in this railway labor dispute and where does the fault really lie?

Simply stated, for over a year the railway workers and management have followed the procedures of the Railway Labor Act in asking for a modest raise to correct gross inequalities. An agreement for an 8 cents per hour increase was duly approved. Then this agreement, arrived at in the way provided by law and not in any way violating the Little Steel formula, was set aside by a change made by some executive board appointed by the President. Not only has the President broken his promise to the railroad workers, for he approved the original agreement, but now through a personal panel he attempts to set aside a contract made in a lawful way. In doing so he attempts to shift the burden of responsibility to railroad workers because they do not want to accept the wholly inadequate and illegal recommendations of this board which would set aside the procedures established in law by the people's elected representatives in Congress.

I am reminded of the old story about the thief who attempted to prevent capture by pointing at some innocent individual in the crowd and yelling hysterically, although not over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, "Catch that thief."

I am suspicious that some of the long-haired Socialists in Washington would like to provoke a railroad strike so that the Government could take over the railroads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a constituent of mine relating to post-war planning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, to include a speech by the Reverend John A. Ryan, and also to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, and to include a statement by the Director of Industrial Relations of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record with reference to rural electrification, and to include therein an address by the Honorable Clyde Ellis, a former Member of the House from Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

FEED GRAIN, DUTY FREE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 171, to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 171, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of House Joint Resolution 171.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous order of the House 1 hour has been allowed for general debate, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how wide the interest is in this, what I would call, rather important piece of legislation. Would it be possible to extend the time for debate by unanimous consent, inasmuch as there have been requests for time? I do not know how many requests the Chairman has had.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that cannot be done. It could have been done in the House, but it cannot be done now.

Mr. REED of New York. That is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has correctly answered the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. House Joint Resolution 171 permits the free importation

for a period of 90 days of certain grains and other products when used for feed for livestock and poultry. As is known to all of you, the farmers have been called upon to increase the production of livestock and poultry, and of course, in order to do that an adequate supply of feed is necessary. It is also known that in certain sections of the country last year there was a serious drought and it caused a very considerable shortage of these feeds. The purpose of this resolution is to admit, free of duty, into the United States, these mentioned feeds in order that the farmers may have, especially in drought-stricken sections of the United States, sufficient and adequate supplies of feed to produce the food they have been called upon by the Government to produce. It is limited to a period of 90 days.

This resolution has the support of the Food Administrator, Hon. Marvin Jones, whom you all know well and favorably. I have a letter from him approving the legislation. It is too long to read and it is not necessary, but I will quote a few lines:

I am, of course, strongly in favor of any legislation which would be effective in making available to producers feed in greater quantities or at lower prices, and to the extent that House Joint Resolution 155—

Now, House Joint Resolution 171—

would be effective in this respect, I favor its enactment.

Later on he says:

While I am entirely in accord with the objective of House Joint Resolution 155, to make feed available to livestock producers in greater quantities and at lower prices, the resolution may not accomplish as much as we would like, except as to hay. At the same time, we favor its enactment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman explain why corn is not in this resolution? There is a great deal of need in my section of the country for corn.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe that question might be answered better by the author of the resolution, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], so I yield to him to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As far as corn is concerned, there is not any corn available anywhere in the world that would be expected to come in during this 90 days. There is a possibility of getting corn at a later time when the crop in South America is harvested, but there is no available corn, so I am advised by the War Food Administration at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for an observation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The time is short, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Would it not be advisable to amend the resolution so that corn might be admitted if it should subsequently become available?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That matter can be taken up under the 5-minute rule when amendments will be in order.

In conclusion, I believe the adoption of this resolution will have a tendency to relieve an acute shortage of feeds necessary in the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the author of the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to make every effort to provide feed for the livestock producers of this country. It is necessary to go back to March 15, and if you are interested in reading the Record of that date, you will note that when I first called the attention of Congress to this coming feed situation, the very best quality of wheat was only 84 cents—United States money—a bushel in Canada, and other feeds were cheap accordingly. On April 29, as I remember it, the President by proclamation provided that wheat feed could be imported, duty free. I am informed that up to this time, this has brought in somewhere between thirty-five and forty million bushels of wheat. This feed wheat that has been brought in has all had to be funneled through a Government agency—in this case through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the wheat feed that has been brought in has first had to go through this organization, and possibly much more feed would have been imported if it had been admitted to the farm cooperatives, the feed dealers, and individual farmers all over the country, to secure this feed for themselves and on equal terms.

I realize that, as a person who has made a few remarks on tariff and duties during his lifetime, it might look rather inconsistent to my colleagues, but I am sure it is not inconsistent as far as I am concerned myself. My particular ideas about the tariff are of little consequence at this time.

Through Secretary Wickard, he asked the livestock people of this country to increase the production of livestock, and they have done a magnificent job, and if we keep on spending as much time talking about roll-back subsidies as we have in the last couple of months, I am not sure but that we will have to get Mr. Wickard back here to get this production program into operation again. In other words, at this time, I think each and every one of us is an American before we are Republicans or Democrats. What my opinion in peacetime is with regard to the tariff has nothing to do with what it means to provide sufficient feed during this war. For that reason I am willing to accept all the insinuations and all the criticisms that might go along with it.

The only reason I did not bring this resolution in last March was because I did not think I had any chance of getting it to this floor. But after I was

home this summer and saw what happened and heard all this talk that we have heard so much about with respect to corn feed, I thought at least, I would make an effort to introduce this resolution. You will remember that on the floor, I asked the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, if he would not try to help get this on the floor of the House. I might say that Mr. McCORMACK did not only promise to do it but he did lend his assistance. He wrote a letter to the Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, and we had a splendid report back from Mr. Jones.

The Ways and Means Committee at that time, of course, had the tax bill under consideration. I tried not to become impatient or irritated, because I realized the importance of the tax measure. I might say that the Committee on Ways and Means has brought this measure out at the first moment they had the time after they got rid of the tax bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to point out that herds of cattle are being killed because of shortage of feed. If the herds are killed, there will be no market for feed. It is essential for every reason to keep the cattle alive during this crisis. That is vital also to western food growers; also, has the gentleman considered including corn in his resolution? We are very short of corn feed in New England. Should it not be included in case we might get it from the Argentine?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer by saying that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] pointed out the possibilities of securing cottonseed meal from Mexico in the spring of the year at lambing time, which surely should have been incorporated if I had been cognizant of its importance. As to corn, I personally know of no reason why corn should not be included. The only reason I had for not including corn was the fact that I was advised by the War Food Administration that there was no available corn. There may be some in South America when the crop is harvested within the next few months and becomes available.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to bring in wheat for feed from Canada.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; from any country, not necessarily from Canada only.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; from any country; and it comes in duty-free.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has suggested, we have brought in thirty-five or forty million bushels by that method.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; between thirty-five and forty million bushels.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not a fact that we have established a quota system by which we are not allowed to bring in more than a certain number of bushels from Canada, for instance? How is this measure affected by the quota system, or vice versa?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The quota system is in effect purely on wheat that is imported for milling purposes. The quota on this wheat is 800,000 bushels a year; but that has nothing to do with feed wheat, and that is what this resolution deals with.

I realized that this resolution should come from our side of the House because I can see the criticisms that might be leveled at the President if he had just made a blanket lifting of this duty. For that reason we are not doing anything that is not being done now as far as wheat feed is concerned; we are just extending it to these other feeds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My understanding is that the Commodity Credit Corporation is bringing in just about as much wheat as it can bring in, in view of limited transportation facilities. What is the gentleman's reply to that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Having received part of my salary from the Government for many years I never would come to the conclusion that just because a Federal agency could not do a job that it could not be done otherwise. I believe that possibly if you give the farm co-ops, feed dealers, and individuals that are handling feeds in the Nation an equal chance with our governmental agencies I think there is a possibility at least that much greater amounts of feed could have been brought in. As to what may be brought in hereafter I have no way of knowing, and assume no personal responsibility.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Wisconsin has given this matter considerable study, and that was the next question I was going to ask: About what increase does the gentleman expect from this measure if it is adopted?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I cannot answer that question because there are too many factors affecting it. I can well see where many agencies might stymie it. I can see how the Office of Defense Transportation may not let them have a car; I can see where they may not let them have even a ship to bring in the feed. I will not assume responsibility for the amount that is brought in. I feel I have made my own personal contribution to this, that I have made the effort at least to provide this feed to help these people finish the job we have asked them to do. Our governmental agencies asked for more hogs, more milk, more chickens; we should be willing to help these producers secure the feed to finish this job.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of my committee.

Mr. RIZLEY. I notice the resolution does not contain any language that de-

fines wheat for feed as the term is used in the resolution. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he does not think that possibly with this letting down of the bars they may bring in all the milling wheat duty-free from Canada for the 90-day period that anyone wants to bring in?

And I might say in connection with that that the War Food Administrator certainly takes that view in a statement that was inserted in the Record under date of October 7, 1943, in which he pointed out that you included flax, and he states that flax was seldom used for feed.

He points out in the same letter that under the terms of the resolution wheat could very well be brought in for milling purposes. Would the gentleman be willing to confine his resolution to wheat, or just what is the purpose of the resolution? Is it to let down the bars so that wheat regardless of what it may be used for may be brought in duty-free from Canada or any other country for a period of 90 days?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Personally I do not think there is any more danger of bringing it in under this resolution than the way it is being operated at the present time. If anyone wants to protect that situation, it certainly is agreeable as far as I am concerned. Referring to the letter that Mr. Jones wrote about flax, of course, he does not write every letter he sends out. It may be just as well to let flax come into this country without duty at this time as anything else. I may say it is coming in at the present time. I will not say it is all coming in from Canada, but it is coming in. It provides a high protein feed, as well as oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss details of this bill because that has already been done to some extent. Every Member on this floor knows the purpose of the bill. There is an imperative demand in the Northeastern States for livestock feed. Take New York and the New England States, some 12 States other than New York, they are in desperate need of more milk and more eggs.

In the State of New York the shortage of feed is at the present time jeopardizing not only the production of dairy products but the life of 1,500,000 dairy cows and heifers. In the State of New York alone there are some 12,000,000 chickens. Milk, dairy products, and eggs are a fundamental necessity to the normal development of the child life of this Nation.

The purpose of the pending bill is to permit feed to come into this country duty-free for 90 days. There is a food emergency, and it is a serious emergency. We cannot afford to have these tested herds in the Northeastern States, particularly in my State of New York and in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, destroyed or starved or used for beef be-

cause it takes too long to develop a dairy industry.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield? If he would include Vermont in his statement, I would be more than satisfied.

Mr. REED of New York. Vermont is included. I said 12 States other than New York. I know the gentleman's State produces a very fine high-grade milk.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to quibble over whether this should or should not include corn. We know there is a shortage of corn in this country. The Northeastern States, including the State of New York, have done everything humanly possible to draw upon the corn supply, whatever it is and no matter how much it may cost. They have tried to get corn from the Middle West to feed the stock and poultry. Nobody is criticizing the Middle West, because, according to the available figures, they have not the corn to send east. There is a shortage of corn, as the distinguished author of the bill stated, all over the world.

We have 6,000,000 children in this country who are undernourished. We have from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 babies in this country dependent for their normal development upon eggs and milk, which must come from well-fed dairy herds.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. In reference to the point raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma, I invite attention to the fact it is very clearly stated on the face of the bill as follows, line 8: "To be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry." That is what the bill itself says.

Mr. REED of New York. I was going to bring out that limitation. Every one of you know that at the present time we can ship babies' diapers over to north Africa by the hundreds of thousands. We can spread our billions everywhere. But the most vital thing in this country today as our soldiers are dying on the battlefields is to see that we develop a strong, virile, hopeful youth to take the place of those who are going to be sacrificed in this struggle. This cannot be done without a minimum of the fundamental diet for the proper development of these children.

I would be the last man in the House of Representatives to stand up here and ask for a reduction in the tariffs for I have fought reduction of tariffs in season and out of season. I am going to insert in the Record certain figures showing exactly what we will be up against as a result of lowering these tariffs as a post-war problem. But the time has come for action and even if this bill does not accomplish all that we think it ought to accomplish, it may assist materially in getting feed for livestock. I am not one of those, and I do not think you are, who in this critical stage is going before the country without saying that we have at least tried to get livestock feed in

here from Canada and other countries where it can be found.

The point has been raised that it will cost a high price for the feed because of certain differentials in Canada and all that, but that has nothing to do with the situation. In the State of New York where we are trying to save our dairy herds with which to supply the cities with milk they are willing to pay almost any price for feed rather than sacrifice their herds, hoping to nurse their dairy cattle along until the next crops are produced.

But just remember this. There will be men on the floor who will say they do not object to hay coming in, but anybody who is familiar with the dairy business knows that all you can do with hay is keep your cows alive and get a subnormal production of milk and dairy products. That just keeps them alive, but that is not enough, because the milk supply is falling in these cities, and the people in your hospitals, your old people, and your children are suffering as a result of it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman, I know, is only supporting this bill as a measure of necessity. The gentleman has never lost an opportunity to fight for our home markets for the protection of labor, industry, and agriculture. Already physicians have stated that the health of the country has been lowered.

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question but that the health of this country is breaking down. I repeat, no matter how much we sympathize with the people abroad, we must protect the children and the babies of this country for they are the America of tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think the emergency will be over in 90 days, or is this just an opening wedge to make it permanent?

Mr. REED of New York. It is not an opening wedge for anything.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is 90 days.

Mr. REED of New York. Ninety days will possibly make the situation such that they can nurse their herds along and keep the production up for 90 days, or get in enough during the 90 days to carry them over until they can get feed from their own farms in this country. I am not worried about that. The people will see to that. When the time comes, if they want a tariff to protect our farmers, they will put on a tariff. They are not worried about taking this off. This cannot be by any stretch of the imagination be a precedent for lower tariffs hereafter.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Is it not a fact that the farmers, whom some would seek to protect, are more interested in this resolution than anybody else?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; there is no doubt of it.

I have here some very interesting facts which I should like to bring out just to show you the danger the gentleman points out. I can give you the wage per hour figures of every one of the countries in South America. I have them listed and I am going to ask the privilege of including them in my remarks. But I do hope that in view of this emergency, no matter what your views may be on the tariff question, you will realize that the cities, in the East particularly, are dependent upon our dairy herds in these States, and will vote for this bill to give our farmers a fighting chance for some feed, no matter what it costs, in order to protect this industry that is so essential to the health of this Nation.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I wish to commend the learned gentleman from New York for his position on the bill, and to add that in my section of the United States, the Pacific Northwest, the situation is equally acute with that of New York and New England. We feel the need for this legislation just as does the section of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, this does not apply only to the East, it applies to every dairy section in the country. This bill is just as valuable to the State of Texas or any of the Western States, unless it might be right in the heart of the Corn Belt, as it is to the East. Certainly I can see no reason why the farmers of one section of the country should line up against the farmers of another section in a vital time during a great war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that this resolution would be necessary if so many thousands of acres had not been taken out of production by the so-called planners for the food program?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, the gentleman knows exactly how I feel on that question, but I am not trying to inject any comments here that would cause any friction or ill feeling. What I am after now is just what I have stated. It is absolutely necessary that we have the supply of milk that is necessary, unless we want to bring up a generation of children with rickets and destroy the bone-building processes which are necessary. Of course, then we can oppose this bill on many grounds. I believe this bill will bring some relief, I do not know how much. For what relief it will bring I am for it.

A report from the State of New York indicates that failure to obtain this feed will result in a 15- to 20-percent drop in production. Such drop in production will mean a cut of 1,300,000 to 1,700,000 quarts a day in the New York State milk production.

There is not the slightest hope of getting dairy feed from the Corn Belt.

There seems to be no doubt whatever that the amount of corn left over from last year is less than the amount left over a year ago from 1941. I am informed that the corn carry-over in the United States was less than 400,000,000 bushels, compared with a 600,000,000-bushel carry-over a year ago.

The only recourse in obtaining feed for dairy herds and poultry now seems to be to import it. This bill seeks to encourage the importation of feed by eliminating the tariff for 90 days.

Mr. Chairman, there is no justification for failing to act on this measure on the theory that it may not accomplish all that may be desired. Why, in an emotional burst of humanitarian enthusiasm, should we direct our attention solely to the undernourished children abroad and in doing so ignore our underfed children at home? The children of today will be the citizens of tomorrow. There are estimated to be at the present time 6,000,000 children in the United States who are improperly nourished. Then, too, there are the thousands of tubercular children whose chance for recovery depends in large part upon an adequate supply of wholesome milk, cream, and eggs. Are we to add to the 300,000 crippled by depriving children of bone-building dairy products?

I repeat that if ever there was a time in our history when a strong and virile youth is needed to supply our future leadership it will be at the conclusion of this war. We must not, by our shortsightedness in the matter of our home food supply, destroy or weaken millions of our potential citizens—now in their infancy—who will be needed to replace the young men now on the battle fronts who, had their lives been spared from the holocaust of war, would have supplied the Nation with gifted civic leaders for tomorrow.

I believe it far more important for this Government to produce milk and eggs for our forty-five or fifty million children than to send 600,000 diapers under lend-lease to North Africa.

I would be the last man on the floor of the House to advocate the lowering of the tariff on farm products in normal times. So far as I am concerned this 90-day exemption of tariff duties on feed for livestock will not be a precedent binding upon me on the question of tariff duties. There is no Member of the House who fears a low-tariff policy, now embodied in the trade agreements, as a post-war danger more than I do. But under a program of lease-lending everything from diapers to shorts and promising to furnish a quart of milk a day to every Hottentot in the world, our own citizens must turn to extraordinary means in order to live.

I am well aware of the danger of further lowering tariffs because our farmers will eventually be urged as a good-neighbor policy to permit imports from this hemisphere where the wage rates are as follows:

According to domestic statistics, intelligently gathered by the C. T. A. L.—

a pioneer in this worthy task—the average hourly wage of a United States worker in at least 10 of the most common occupations—construction work, carpentering, mining, unskilled labor, printing, driving, painting, and so forth—is \$1.33. In contrast, the average hourly wage in other republics of the hemisphere for more or less the same group of workers is: Canada, 56 cents per hour; Argentina, 30 cents; Uruguay, 25 cents; Cuba, 20 cents; Colombia, 14 cents; Mexico, 13 cents; Costa Rica, 11 cents; Bolivia, 9 cents; Chile, 6 cents; Ecuador and the Dominican Republic, 5 cents each. From \$1.33 to 5 United States cents—a nickel, a package of chewing gum—so goes the scale of hourly wages, unevenly distributed among similar workers of our hemisphere. The data show, not what the workers of the hemisphere comparatively earn, but what they buy with what they earn.

Let us consider only some of the essential items of food, such as bread, beef, milk, eggs, and sugar. In the United States the average worker earns, per hour, enough to buy 7.8 kilos of bread, while an hour's work by a Canadian worker in substantially the same occupation earns enough to buy only 4.3 kilos of bread; by an Argentinean, 3.2; Uruguayan, 2.9; a Cuban, 1.7; a Chilean, 1.4; a Mexican, 1.1; a Colombian, 1.0; a Costa Rican, 0.9; a Dominican, 0.5; an Ecuadorian, 0.4; and Bolivian, 0.3. Thus, to take the two extremes only, a United States worker is paid, in bread, some 20 times as much as his fellow worker in Bolivia. In terms of beef, the situation is as follows:

United States, 2 kilos; Canada, 1.1; Argentina, 1.6; Uruguay, 2; Mexico, 0.6; Colombia, 0.3; Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia, 0.2 each; Dominican Republic, 0.1. That is to say, United States workers are paid, in terms of beef, 10 times more than some of their fellow workers in Latin America.

In milk, United States workers' pay is good for more than 12 times the amount that can be purchased by their Latin American brothers.

In sugar, the situation is still favorable to the United States workers. They can buy with their wages 30 times as much sugar as, for instance, the workers of the Dominican Republic. It is sad to say that even in Cuba, which exports sugar in large amounts, workers can purchase only one-fifth of the amount which United States workers can buy with their wages. Finally, in terms of eggs, the hourly wage of the United States worker allows him to buy 53.4; Canada, 21.5; Argentina, 24.4; Uruguay, 16.6; Colombia, 8; Mexico, 7.5; Costa Rica, 6.4; Chile, 4.5; Ecuador, 3.3; Bolivia, 2.9; and the Dominican Republic, 2.4.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the objective of H. R. 171 is to make feed available for our livestock producers in greater quantities and at lower prices. This is a worthy objective at a time when our livestock, dairy, and poultry pro-

ducers find it most difficult to secure a sufficient quantity of feed for maximum food production.

Personally, I am as interested in securing maximum food production as those who favor this bill. A study of this resolution, plus several conferences with officials in the departments charged with the responsibility of purchasing feed grains from foreign countries, convinces me that the approval of this resolution would impair present satisfactory importations.

The approval of this resolution would—

First. Set a most dangerous precedent by removing tariff on wheat, oats, barley, hay, flax, and cottonseed.

Second. It would not make available greater supplies of feed grains.

Third. The Federal Treasury would be forced to pay large sums of money in the form of equalization fees to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Fourth. It would add another type of wheat and other grains to the regular trade. At present we have feed wheat and regular wheat. Now we would add regular imported wheat for feed.

Fifth. It would remove the tariff protection that farmers, laborers, and industry must have if we are to carry our national debt and present tax burden in order to assist our allies and our own Nation in the full prosecution of the war.

I do not impugn the motive of those who favor this legislation—in fact, I fully understand their concern. This proposed resolution will not help the American livestock, dairy, and poultry producers. It will, however, be a financial boon to the Canadian farmer. It will set a dangerous precedent by removing the tariff on wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, hay, and cottonseed. This bill does not apply to Canada alone. It removes all tariffs and duties on the commodities listed and places the American farmer in competition with the farmers of every nation in the world that produces these crops. I cannot believe the sponsors of this legislation would favor the enactment of a bill that would place the American wheat grower in direct competition with the wheat producers of Argentina, Canada, and Australia, or that would place the American farmer who produces oats, barley, and rye in competition with the farmers of every other country that produces these grains.

During the past 2 years our Government has used incentive payments to secure additional acreage of flax; now it is proposed that we remove the tariff from flax, and these farmers who have received Government aid for flax production will be placed in competition with the world. We would remove the tariff from cottonseed and tell the farmers of the South that they must now meet the competition of the cottonseed producers of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay.

Let us not be carried away by emotional appeal. Let us analyze this bill. We have a real shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products. Would it not be as reasonable to suggest that we remove the tariffs on these products? We could use more dairy products. I am sure the sponsors of this legislation would

oppose most vigorously the removal of the tariff protection on those commodities. More than that, I would help them in their opposition to protect the farmers and dairymen from the direct competition of dairy producers in every country in the world. If we believe in this policy, then why not remove all tariffs and let the farmers, laborers, and industry compete with these same groups in every nation?

Personally, I want to retain our American standard of living for the American people. Our citizens are assuming a national debt which may reach \$300,000,000,000; they are carrying a tax load that approximates one-third of our national income in order that we can aid other nations fighting with us to save the world from dictatorship and despotic rule. Does anyone believe we could carry the present tax burden on the income of the farmers with the cheap lands and the peon labor of foreign countries? It is a dangerous step to take.

I stated the approval of this bill would not be of assistance to the livestock, dairy, and poultry producers of the Nation. On April 13, 1942, the President, by Presidential proclamation, amended the import quotas of grain so as to permit the entry of additional imports which might be used for distress purposes resulting from war developments. On April 29, 1943, the quota regulations were amended to permit imports by the War Food Administrator or his designated representative. Today the Commodity Credit Corporation is actively purchasing and importing every item specified in this bill. They have sufficient funds and an effective organization to make these purchases. The tariff is no factor. Importations are limited only by the quantity of grain available and transportation. Despite the transportation problem we have imported enormous quantities of grain during the past few months. We purchased and imported over 100,000,000 bushels of oats and barley from Canada during the 12-month period, ending July 31, 1943. Barley has also come in from Argentina. Fifty-four million bushels of wheat have been purchased in Canada and delivered in the United States. Options have been secured on 6,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat which is now being delivered. Arrangements are being made to import 150,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada during the period from October 1, 1943, to October 1, 1944. In addition to these purchases of wheat from Canada, we have received about 2,000,000 bushels of wheat from Argentina. They are producing a record crop of wheat and unlimited quantities can be secured in that nation. These large importations prove that the tariff is no obstacle to the movement of this grain needed for distress purposes.

We have imported 5,000,000 bushels of rye, large shipments of hay, and arrangements are being made to purchase Canada's surplus flax of about 10,000,000 bushels.

Cottonseed is now being imported from Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and

Uruguay. The tariff of \$6 per ton has no effect on the amount being brought in.

I stated that the approval of this bill would be a financial boon to the farmers of Canada. The Canadian Government has authorized the collection of an equalization fee which removes any price spread between Canadian prices and the United States prices on grain at United States ports. For instance, in September barley was sold at Buffalo, N. Y., at \$1.19 per bushel. The Canadian ceiling price for barley was 59 cents per bushel. You add 6 cents per bushel freight and 15 cents per bushel duty, which makes a total of 80 cents per bushel at Buffalo. The Canadian Government added an equalization fee of 39 cents per bushel, or sold this Canadian barley at Buffalo for \$1.19 per bushel. The money accumulated by this equalization fee is distributed among the farmers of western Canada. As our Government sells Canadian wheat for feed at corn parity prices, the Government would sustain an additional loss if the present tariff of 42 cents were added to the Canadian price as an equalization fee. The livestock producers, dairymen, and the poultry raisers would not receive their feed at a lower cost. The taxpayer would be forced to make up this difference, and the only one to benefit would be the Canadian farmer—or the farmer of any country that might take advantage of the same system. In other words, our Government would be sending equalization-fee checks to the farmers of Canada. When there is no gain for our own producers, why should we assume this additional financial burden?

The practical thing to do is to defeat this bill. Furnish the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation with sufficient funds and personnel to purchase the grains needed under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 2 more minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not have the time to yield. I wish I had, but I am sorry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] made a mistake a few moments ago when he said that the cost of administration would be so much. To save me, I cannot see where there would be any cost to the Government for administration. The bill merely provides that if you desire to go into Canada and into Mexico and buy feed, you have the right to do it. There is nothing compulsory about it. There is no cost to the Government, not even a 5-cent charge. It merely waives the duty on it when you bring it in. Customs officers are already on duty at these ports of entry. They are paid a monthly salary and they are on duty so many hours out of the day. There is no cost attached to it.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield just for a correction?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman from Texas misunderstood, I think, equalization fee for administration charges. The administration will not amount to anything, but the equalization fee may and will.

Mr. WEST. If I need the feed badly enough to feed some of my starving cattle and want to pay that equalization fee, I see no objection to it. To give you an illustration, last spring in a section of my district, west San Antonio, where they raise a lot of sheep, we had one of the worst droughts we had in 50 years. It was the lambing season. There was absolutely no feed available for the ewes. There was no cottonseed cake and meal which is necessary to feed them at that period in order for them to give milk. There was plenty of feed available across the river in Mexico, cottonseed cake and meal. We took it up with the O. P. A. The ceiling price of the O. P. A. was \$50 a ton. Cottonseed cake and meal in Mexico was \$50 a ton. The duty was four or five dollars a ton. We took it up with the O. P. A. and asked them to let ranchers go into Mexico and buy feed and pay the duty. They said, "No, you cannot do that because it will cost above the ceiling price of \$50."

As a consequence those ranchers in that section lost about 80 percent of the lamb crop. The increased cost per day would have been from 1 to 2 cents per ewe. Instead of letting those ranchers do that they refused to do so, and, as I say, the result was that we lost about 80 percent of the lamb crop.

There is nothing compulsory about the bill. If you are engaged in the cattle business or in the dairy business and need feed and it is accessible, you can cross the border and buy it and bring it back.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, but if this bill is passed there would not be anything to prevent the importation, without any limitation at all, of all of these grains that are mentioned in the bill, by the dealers in those foreign countries. It would not be a question of the consumer here or the fellow who wanted to use it, but the bars would be down for the fellow engaged in that business, dealing in those grains, to dump them in this country.

Mr. WEST. The gentleman will remember the bill is limited to 90 days.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. WEST. It is my understanding that now there is a black market in cottonseed meal and cake, which normally sells for around \$50. It is now bringing around \$90 in the black market. It is strictly and purely a war-emergency measure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I suggest this: In my own State we have a tremendous surplus of wheat. As a matter of fact, we cannot market it. We do not have storage facilities for the wheat we have, and if we open the doors to Canada to dump it in the United States, we are just

increasing the difficulties that the farmers now find themselves in with reference to this surplus of wheat.

Mr. WEST. Why is it you cannot sell it, with such a terrific shortage?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have no transportation facilities, in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. West] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a letter showing that unless you are close to where there is an elevator you cannot get your wheat in in time to unload it, and in many instances they have to unload it on the ground, because they have not sufficient transportation facilities to take the wheat out of storage and put it on the market.

Mr. WEST. Does not the gentleman think that one fact would prohibit the large importation of feeds from a foreign country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. But there is danger. I am in sympathy with the object of this bill, as far as that is concerned, but I am fearful what will happen to the man who is raising wheat, upon whom we have to depend to pay the tax bill.

Mr. WEST. I think your statement that there is such a limitation on transportation is a safeguard against that happening.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then the condition about storage facilities is another situation that we cannot solve.

Mr. WEST. That is another reason why they will not flood the market in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We cannot get any lumber to build granaries. We cannot get priorities for the lumber.

Mr. WEST. And that would apply to the man who wanted to import it in large quantities, just as well.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know what he would do with it, if he brought it in.

Mr. WEST. So you have nothing to fear on those two scores.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The trouble in Montana is that there are no railroad facilities. I mean there are not sufficient cars to move the concentrated grains from the elevators, thereby making room in the storage elevators for grain to come in from the farms? Is that the difficulty?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is part of the difficulty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What other difficulty could there be? Let us see if this trouble lies with the Office of Defense Transportation or does it lie with some other part of the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are several factors involved. There is the transportation problem. There is the lack of storage facilities which the farmers do not have, because they have not been able to get priorities for lumber to build granaries, and lack of elevator storage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the farmer has the grain ready to move to the elevator, and the Office of Defense Transportation

will furnish the cars to move it from the elevator, then that straightens the whole line. Now, what is the trouble?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, we cannot get cars. You have no place to unload the wheat until you get the cars. Consequently, when the farmers take the wheat to town, they have to haul it back or dump it on the ground.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, that is an O. D. T. job. Let them get the cars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I simply want to call attention to the situation we have there. We have plenty of wheat in Montana if we could get it moved.

Mr. WEST. Does not the gentleman think the big dealer would have the same trouble that your farmer has, and as a consequence, there would not be any large importation? We along the border when we have dry spells could take our trucks, go into Mexico, get a truckload of feed and save our livestock.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has instanced some very fine cases, but suppose the dealers on the other side of the line, over in Canada, put the stuff into this country? What are we going to do with it?

Mr. WEST. They would be faced with identically the same transportation problems we have. I believe the gentleman is just trying to scare up a bugaboo.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am concerned. I am trying to look at it from the point of view of those who are going to have to pay the tax bill in this country.

Mr. WEST. We are trying to protect the livestock in this country if we can.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This question may have been answered before I came into the Chamber, and if it has been I ask the gentleman's pardon, but I notice this bill makes no provision for the importation of corn. In my country corn is a very scarce article of feed. I am wondering why corn is not included.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. That question has been raised and was discussed here rather generally before the distinguished gentleman from Virginia came in. The information given us was that no corn is available to be brought in and will not be available until the South American crop is ready, and that will not be ready until after the 90 days have expired.

Mr. WEST. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is it not a fact that anything at this time that helps the livestock industry and the poultry industry and the dairy industry helps the people of the entire country?

Mr. WEST. The gentleman from North Carolina is absolutely right. That is the situation that needs correcting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein some tables I have prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be necessary for the gentleman to get permission in the House to insert extraneous matter.

The gentleman may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks if there is no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a tariff bill, to take tariffs off of agricultural products. Both parties are for tariffs at the present time; they have declared so in their platforms and in their votes on this floor. This bill is not a protective-tariff bill, for it injures those who raise these products and does not protect them from foreign importation but encourages foreign imports duty free. It is not a reciprocal trade tariff, for we get nothing by way of reciprocity from Canada, Mexico, or whatever country the imported article may come from. Therefore anyone who believes in the tariff principle or in the reciprocal trade principle cannot support this bill consistently.

For many years, fifty, sixty, or a hundred, the farmers of the Middle West, and especially those in Iowa, have supported custom duties commonly called tariffs. During these days it was argued that when you have a thing on an export basis the tariff on that thing does no good; that is to say, if the country was an exporter of corn there was no use of a tariff on corn and such tariff was inoperative. That kind of argument prevailed for many, many years. Finally both parties agreed on an agricultural tariff. They put a tariff on corn of 25 cents in 1930. It has done much good, for very little corn is exported.

The very folks who have always wanted tariffs are against them now insofar as they apply to something the farmer raises; they come in now and desert the tariff principle. They desert it now. That is what this bill does. Overnight, just because these deserters say there is some shortage in feeds, they think we ought to import, free of duty, the feeds they wish to buy. This will cut short the profits which the farmers should get. It is all right for us to vote tariff protection on the things they raise or produce or manufacture, but it is all wrong for the farmer to get this same protection.

Let us look for a moment at the figures that were given out the other day and came to our desks yesterday from the Department of Agriculture, and issued in October of this year. This shows that the stocks of wheat on farms in this country in the month of October were higher than the 10-year average from 1932 to 1941, much higher. The 10-year average was 81.6 percent higher than then, but at the present time, 1943, it is 81.9 percent higher. The quantity of wheat is in the same condition. The

stocks of wheat on the farms in October were about 57 percent higher than the 10-year average, as shown by this pamphlet here. The 1942 crop is not a fair crop by which to measure because it was an unprecedented crop. You can go on down through the rest of the grains. Let us take oats: There is a 14-percent increase in the stock of oats on farms. The old wheat in the internal mills and elevators and warehouses this year is much more than it was during the period from 1935 to 1941.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. My time has about expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will not the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is there any shortage of any of the commodities mentioned in this bill in this country today?

Mr. GILCHRIST. It is not so stated in the articles and publications of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then it is a question of price.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Oh, it is just a question of price. People who have profited by the tariff all these years now see a chance to make money if they can escape paying tariff duties on what the farmers produce. They want to import from Argentina or Canada duty-free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in order to keep the record straight and to keep everybody on the beam I would like to correct our good friend and colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], because if you heard his statement the way I did you might infer that all this feed is coming in at the present time without any duty on it. I am sure it is the wheat feed that is coming in without duty.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think the gentleman states my position correctly. All this feed can be brought in duty free under the President's proclamation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; maybe it could, but it is not being brought in by this governmental agency. If it is the position of any individual or any group that the Government should be the only one in business, if that is their position, and up to this time I have never heard anyone stand up here on the floor and criticize what is taking place at the present time with this feed coming through one governmental agency, they surely have a right to take that position.

I happen to be one who believes that the farm cooperatives, the feed dealers, the individual farmers themselves are entitled to the same consideration in the

markets of this country as is any Government agency. A lot of the pressure and a lot of the criticism against the Commodity Credit Corporation could have been and would have been avoided if these private farm cooperatives and feed dealers and individuals had had the same opportunities that have been accorded to our governmental agency. Of course, that is not the fundamental reason why we should pass this bill. That is incidental to it. I am willing to subscribe to a program that the Government shall handle all of it if I thought the Government could do it better than having it handled in any other way, but I do not subscribe to that position. As far as the gentleman from Kansas is concerned, it is not necessary for him to take this floor, or for anyone else, and state what my position is, but in case he should take it upon himself to attack my position in reference to a duty on dairy products, a pretty good way to find out would be to introduce a resolution and he would not have to work on it so many months because it would be referred to his committee. In that way he can find out whether I am interested in trying to furnish the food to win the war or I am just trying to look after the people in my particular district and State.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If I at any time inferred that the gentleman had stated taking all tariffs off of all products, I want to remove that doubt. I say that, if an effort were made to amend this bill to include dairy products, I would be very glad to help him.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as far as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is concerned, I realize I am in a very embarrassing position today. I think a lot of the gentleman. If all this feed is in storage in this country that he says there is, why is it that no one can get to it? What do we hear every day in this House? Now, let us analyze this thing, and I am not going to give a lot of information about these imports. I keep pretty close track of them. You and I know they are not supposed to be given to the public. Do you realize how much of these feeds is going into commercial channels today that never did in normal times? Under normal times, 55 percent of the commercial corn comes from Iowa and Illinois. What percentage of the corn for commercial and not livestock-feed purposes do you think Iowa and Illinois are now called upon to furnish? What is the amount of wheat going into alcohol and the amount of corn going into alcohol? What is supplying the market for the former imports of the material to provide tapioca pudding? Just think of the demand there is for these foods. You cannot think of this in terms of some past years' accumulation; you must think of it in terms of our commitments and of our expended use of these grain products at this particular time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman mentioned something about the question why dairy products were not included. Why did he not include dairy products? There is a shortage.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentlewoman wants to know why I did not include dairy products?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That was not the point under consideration.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is in this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We produced more milk in the past year than ever before in the history of the country, except the year previous. Our commitments are not for grains. Our commitments of a foreign nature are for livestock products. The production of livestock and livestock products is what is giving us the trouble. That is where we are going to have our trouble and that is where our commitments are for lend-lease and to foreign sources.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman would not say there is a shortage of dairy products in this country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I do not think there is a shortage when it is the second biggest production in history.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why did not the gentleman include them?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The second greatest production of dairy products occurred in 1943, exceeded only by 1942. In this last month they jumped up to 27,000,000 pounds of powdered milk. There are increasing commitments and demands. Every pound of that powdered milk is going to the armed forces of this country scattered all over the world. If we do not provide the feed, the commitments will of necessity have to be curtailed. In addition, we will have to further limit the consumption of livestock products in our own country, too. We are naturally going to be shorter and shorter of dairy products, and we must have the feed in order to produce these products anywhere near our needs.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why is the gentleman coming here with a bill that favors the dairymen and that does not provide for importing dairy products, when people are hungry for milk and dairy products?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure the gentlewoman would be fair-minded enough to be for dairy products when she realizes that the dairy cow is the most efficient farm animal you can feed to, that she will produce three to four times as much human food as would be produced if the feed was fed to some other animals. I am not defending the dairy industry any more than to say that the product that is needed in the war effort today is dairy products.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I say. Why do you not let us support it?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. We are committed to sending a quart of milk to every person in the world, and we are sending our products abroad. That is one reason why we are short of many things. We must produce more not only for ourselves but for many countries abroad.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. As far as Canada is concerned, its supply of hogs and dairy products that are exportable would be insignificant as far as coming into this country is concerned at this time and in the face of the world needs.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We are not doing this just for the benefit of Canada, I hope.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I should like to have one thing straightened out, and I think a lot of other Members of the House would, too. It is conceded that if the amount of grain we have in this country now were properly distributed we would have a sufficiency for everybody. Is not that a fact?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not subscribe to that, because there are industrial uses of grain this year that I do not believe the average one of us takes into consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. The record showed there was sufficient.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The record showed what happened to be on hand, but the record did not show the commitments.

Mr. JENSEN. The commitments are about the same as they were.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We had better look abroad and see what the commitments are. The commitments on some of these products are 100 percent for lease-lend and for the armed forces. They are taking nearly 100 percent of some commodities, like powdered eggs, of our country today.

Mr. JENSEN. That may be, but the fact still remains that we have a bumper crop this year of almost all products.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And a superabundant demand.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know whether I would say superabundant demand or not. We have had a big demand for 3 years and we still have a big surplus in the granaries and on the farms.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Our stock pile has just gradually gone down. I will not say it has disappeared, but it has disappeared pretty much. If the gentleman will look up the figures as to the Western Hemisphere, he will find that if we end up this year with 300,000,000 bushels of wheat we may be fortunate. I am pretty sure that we would all be pretty well pleased if we could know that we will have that much wheat left on hand on July 1, 1944.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have been wondering why the gentleman does not put corn on this list. After all is said and done, the west coast has a great need for corn and we cannot get it. The only place we can get it is a place that is not cooperating very well with the United Nations, namely, Argentina. Nevertheless, we are in terrific need of corn for poultry feeding and cattle feeding on the west coast. Why is not that on this list?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It has been brought out a couple of times on the floor that there is not any corn available to be shipped in during this 90 days.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean from Argentina?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not mention any country. If it were available anywhere in the world to be brought in, I am sure there is not a fair-minded person on this floor who would not be willing to include corn in that list.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, every Member in this House is in sympathy with what this resolution wants to do—namely, bring more feed to the areas where there is a shortage. I want to point out, however, that this cannot be done by the mere passage of a resolution. The passing of a resolution does not produce crops.

It has been pointed out on the floor of the House this afternoon that the Commodity Credit Corporation under Presidential directive is now bringing into this country all the feeds that are available and which can be transported. If this resolution is passed it will simply mean that we are subsidizing other countries and it may well cost the United States Treasury and the people \$50,000,000. It will, at the same time, not bring more feed into the country.

I wish to point out that this country produced in excess of 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn last year. This is the second largest crop in the history of this country. There are two difficulties in the present distribution of the feed supplies in this country. The first is transportation, the second is the price. Transportation facilities have been lacking. It has been more profitable to feed corn and wheat to hogs than to send the corn to market.

It seems to me that the whole thing finally boils down to the fact that there has been a bungling by the Federal agencies, namely, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Food Administration in that they have produced a confusion by their many useless and conflicting regulations. It becomes more and more apparent that the difficulties in the production and distribution of food would be solved if there was one Federal agency in entire control over all the phases of production, processing, selling, and transportation of food.

It is impossible for the farmers of this country to proceed with confidence under the present confusing and conflicting regulations.

It has been but a few months ago that the War Food Administration was urging the farmers to produce more hogs and then before these hogs were hardly ready for market the cry went out, you have raised too many, cut down the hogs. The War Food Administration in announcing their new program is asking for a reduction in the number of livestock raised on the farms. Yet we have another segment of the population crying out that there isn't enough food to go around. You hear the charge that the feeders of cattle are getting too much money. I want the RECORD to show at this point something about the price of cattle as it has existed in the past. Today, in Omaha, Nebr., top cattle must sell for \$15.60 per hundred. A few months ago they were selling for \$17.40, in 1942 the top was \$17.20. In 1937 it was \$19.20, in 1928, \$18 a hundred, and in 1927 it was \$17.75. I want to point out that the cost of producing and feeding these cattle has greatly increased. The producer and feeder of livestock today is getting far less than he got in the last several years.

Just last year the farmers were being penalized for raising too much wheat. It was necessary for me to pay a penalty of \$178 before I could even sell my wheat or feed it to the livestock on the farm. Just what kind of a policy does this administration have toward the agriculture interests in this country? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there are many interests in Washington that ought to have the farmers' interest at heart instead of actually being antagonistic.

It has been said that in the beginning of a war the three following things are paramount and in this order: The military, transportation, and food. After a war has proceeded for several years the order is reversed in importance—namely, food, transportation, and then the military. We have reached the place in this country where food may well be more important than bullets, planes, or battle-ships. I would suggest to the consuming East which needs food that it pays some attention to the needs of agriculture and sees that the hard-working farmer receives a reasonable profit for his labors and the things he raises. It might go quite a ways toward producing sufficient food for the consuming sections of the country.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution is not necessary. While it only purports to let down the barriers for 90 days it might well be for 90 weeks or for all time to come. The problem is now being adequately handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation without the payment of a huge sum of money as will certainly be required under this bill. Let the various Federal and bureaucratic agencies handling food be united under one head and the grain produced in this country will receive adequate and prompt distribution, then the need for this resolution need not exist.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this emergency measure should be passed. Out in the Middle West, except in one or two States, we are very short of feedstuffs. There was a feed dealers' convention here the other day. At that convention we were informed that only 2,300 tons of protein feed were at present available for the 2,500,000 dairy cows in Wisconsin. That condition exists not only in Wisconsin but in many other States from there to the Atlantic coast.

I do not know how much feed might be brought in under the provisions of this resolution, but if it will help that situation, certainly it would do a lot of good.

The matter of precedent has been mentioned here. It calls to my mind the incident of about a year ago, when a British and American syndicate purchased some 200,000,000 pounds of coconut oil in foreign countries for shipment to this country. There was a 2-cent excise tax on coconut oil coming into this country. The big soap companies had a large lobby which came before Congress and before the Committee on Ways and Means, of which my esteemed friend from Kansas is a member, to recommend a resolution striking off that excise tax of 2 cents a pound, in order that the Government might have the glycerin which could be produced from oil. There were about 13,000,000 pounds of glycerin in that oil which was used for munitions. On the other hand, we presented to the syndicate and soap companies that got the remaining 187,000,000 pounds of the imported oil approximately three and three-quarter millions of dollars by way of lessened taxes. It was a subsidy for the importation of that oil. We did that for the soap makers. Is it not about time to do something to relieve the farmers who have stock they are shipping to market which is not in a proper condition to be sold? For instance, in Milwaukee, the other day, they were selling feeder pigs weighing 100 pounds for only \$8 a pig. The St. Paul livestock market has been so crowded with hogs, many not fitted for the market by proper feeding, they finally put an embargo on shipments. That is a part of the situation as to feed in the Northwest. Dairy cattle are in need of more feedstuffs and the same is true of hogs and poultry. I feel that the passage of this resolution might aid that situation somewhat. I am in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, the following, when imported into the United States from foreign countries, and when entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the period of 90 days beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this joint resolution, to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry, shall be exempt from duty: Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, or hay, or products in chief value of one or more of the foregoing or derivatives thereof. As used in this joint resolution, the term "United

States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The exemptions from duties provided for by this joint resolution shall be subject to compliance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after "flax", insert "cottonseed."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "and the District of Columbia" and insert "the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 2, line 2, after the word "cottonseed", add the word "corn."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, there has already been some discussion about the insertion of the word "corn." Whether any supplies of corn are immediately available or not, it seems to me highly desirable to have corn embodied in this resolution. It is conceivable, at least, it seems to me that Argentine corn might be available within a period of 90 days from the time this resolution becomes effective; and even if not, the resolution might be further extended. It certainly can do no harm to have corn in the resolution. The need for corn for poultry feed all over the country is very great, as has been evidenced by the questions asked on the floor this morning and the interest in the subject evinced by the various Members. I sincerely hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also include clothing, for instance? That is a necessity. Let us make it all-inclusive and take down the bars on potatoes also. Let us do the whole thing up brown here.

Mr. HALE. Answering the gentleman's question, I thought this was a resolution with relation to livestock and poultry feed. In my district the poultry do not eat clothing.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The committee has no objection to the amendment. I do not think it can do any good or do any harm. There is no objection to the amendment so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have been told by dairy authorities in my district if this resolution is passed without the corn clause and

simply with the wheat for dairy feed, there is not going to be a drop in the bucket in comparison to what we need. I have been trying to get corn for up-state New York for the past several months. I sincerely hope that the House will add corn to this amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield. Mr. REES of Kansas. Where does the gentleman expect to get this corn during the 90-day period?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know where we are going to get it, but I have been trying for 6 months to get it and there has not been any satisfaction given, either from the Middle West or anywhere else. I think it is high time this House did something to try to get corn, so that the people in New York City and every other metropolitan district will have enough milk and enough dairy products this next year. I will say to the House that the situation at the present time in the Northeast has become so serious that a great deal of the shortage will never be able to be made up. This resolution is not going to solve all our problems we are facing. But I am for it, because at least this is going to cure some of the ills that are prevalent in the Northeast. I hope that the amendment to add corn to the list of products named in the bill will be agreed to and I sincerely hope that the resolution itself will be agreed to.

There has been a lot of discussion about this middle western corn from time to time. The other day we were all glad to hear that the O. P. A. had lifted the ceiling price on corn to \$1.16. I do not think it is going to be enough. In fact, I think the next month or two will show that the new ceiling price on corn has not been raised sufficiently to bring enough of it into the Northeast to feed our dairy herds. I, for one, would have advocated a higher ceiling price on corn in order to bring in that corn that we must have in order to salvage what is left of the dairy herds and poultry flocks of the Northeast.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Canada?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We cannot get corn from Canada.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Mexico?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; but you can get it brought in from some of the other countries.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Argentina?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is my understanding that you can.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Are you willing to pay a tariff on the corn that comes from Argentina?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We will not have to if corn is added to this resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In legislation passed 2 or 3 years ago, we empowered the Government to take over any mine or any mill, or any other industry that was needed in the war effort. Why should we not do the same thing with corn?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman does not realize that this is a matter of distribution. We have the corn and we are trying to get it to you. I think this amendment will kill the entire resolution. I think it will be defeated because it will damage the objective of those of us who are trying to get you some feed to feed your milk cows.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to say that the gentleman's efforts have been very sincere and very helpful, but every effort I have brought to this floor in an attempt to remedy the disastrous situation my farmers face has met with nothing but opposition. I will say to the gentleman that I am for anything that will bring in the corn and other feed for our dairy herds and our poultry flocks in the Northeast. We are facing one of the most serious conditions that the country has ever had to face. I appeal not only in behalf of those farmers who are so bereft of feed, but I appeal also for the consumers of the country. Too much stress is being put on this subsidy question. Too much stress is being put on the proposition of what people will have to pay for their food. It is not a case of being able to pay a low price or a high price, but it is a case of being able to get any dairy products or food at all. I say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that every measure that we bring up here must be given careful consideration and I hope this resolution and the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum and I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would the gentleman withdraw that until we come to a vote on this matter and then I will make a point of no quorum.

Mr. STEFAN. I withdraw the point of order at the request of my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thought the gentleman had withdrawn that. I promised to make a point of no quorum if there was not a quorum present when the bill came up for final vote.

Mr. STEFAN. I reserve the right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. STEFAN. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present. A quorum.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to address some questions of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. In his statement a few moments ago, he suggested one of the chief difficulties was the matter of transportation. I presume from that statement that he had investigated that question more or less thoroughly. I believe the gentleman made this statement, that the Government had the money to buy the feed, that the feed is available, and that transportation is one of the serious difficulties. Will the gentleman elaborate on that to some extent.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If the gentleman will yield, I made the statement that there is feed available to be bought. The Commodity Credit Corporation is buying it, and they have the funds they need to buy it with.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there sufficient feed available to be bought?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. Where?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. In Canada. We brought in 54,000,000 bushels of wheat. Since the House committee reported this bill the other day, Canada stopped selling all kinds of grain, and we are now bringing in 6,000,000 bushels of wheat under option.

Beginning October 1, 1943, and extending to October 1, 1944, we make the arrangement to bring in 150,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the only reason we do not get it in in greater quantities is lack of transportation.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there anything we can do on the subject of transportation to expedite the delivery of these feed stuffs into this country? What can be done on that line?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I have discussed this with the War Food Administration, with the Commodity Credit Corporation also, and they tell me they are doing everything they can to bring this grain into this country.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there anything the Congress can do to assist?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Personally, I do not think there is. I think they are doing everything they can. Everyone is conscious that this is a serious problem; the departments see it that way and are trying to work it out. The passage of this resolution will be of no assistance; I think rather it may prove to be an embarrassment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Granting to be true everything the gentleman

from Kansas says, that they have done a splendid job in this wheat feed, I am surprised the gentleman from Kansas wants to keep that Government agency, the only one he says that can do it, for if they have done such a good job with wheat, why can they not do it with barley, oats, and other farm crops?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to answer that.

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The Federal Government has gone into Canada to buy this grain for feed. Thus we have it in the hands of one agency. Why does the gentleman want to send all the feed dealers up into Canada to compete with the United States Government and make the Federal Government pay more for it? Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not going to take anything out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to remind the gentleman from Kansas that wheat is not the only feed that is needed right now. Chickens in my district are dying because of an overdose of wheat. They lack corn, which is the essential feed in the production of poultry and eggs, also dairy products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make inquiry of one of the gentlemen from the corn-producing States: Just why is it they object to including corn in this resolution? I do not care who answers this question but I want to find the answer, because we need corn on the west coast.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield for the answer to my question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have a record corn crop this year, a 3,000,000,000-bushel corn crop, the second largest crop in the history of the United States. The corn is not available to the entire country because of lack of transportation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to know why we cannot get it, because we need it badly on the west coast.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Another important factor is that of price; they can get a better price from their corn by feeding it to hogs than by shipping it to the west coast.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the latter reason is the real one. I am one of the Representatives of one of the largest poultry-producing counties in the United States. I refer to Los Angeles County, Calif. I believe the census statistics will bear out my statement. We are unable to get corn out there. I do not know why you fellows are keeping it, but we cannot get it. We have got to

have it because we need to maintain our production of poultry and eggs, both for the armed forces and for our greatly increased population. Now, let me tell you fellows in the Middle West something. About 2 years ago the price of fryer mash on the coast was \$1.70 a hundred. Now it is up to \$3.60 a hundred and we can hardly get good mash even at that price. The protein content of that mash has dropped about 20 percent since corn was removed as an ingredient. Now, if you want to keep us from getting that mash by holding your corn to feed to hogs, then you are hurting us and yourselves.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman. I want to know the truth.

Mr. HOPE. As far as I am concerned I have no objection to including corn in the present bill. I do not think it will mean that you will get any corn. I do not believe you are going to get any feed under this bill even if we pass it. You will get just as much corn as you will any other feed. The real reason why you are not getting any corn on the west coast has been the matter of the too low price ceiling on corn. It has kept it on the farm where grown. The price ceiling was raised a little on Monday of this week but I do not think it was raised enough. We will, however, have an opportunity to find out whether it was raised enough.

Mr. HINSHAW. There might be one more way of getting it, and that would be to drop the ceiling on hogs. If they lowered the ceiling on hogs in proportion to the corn-hog ratio there would not be so much hoarding of corn to feed to hogs.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Well, let us lower the ceiling on hogs to \$2.50 a hundred. That would release plenty of corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do not be absurd; I am not asking anything like that but I think there is an inequality here, either in a too-low price of corn or a too-high price of hogs, that should be equalized to release some of this surplus corn for other areas of the country that need it so badly.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It should be used for something else than feeding hogs.

Mr. HINSHAW. It should indeed. There is plenty of corn that would be sold if it were not for the high price you can get for hogs.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What does the gentleman think they ought to pay? More than \$3.60 for mash? About \$1.20 per bushel would bring the corn out of Iowa.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me that the sections raising corn are hurting the rest of us who have to buy it, while at the same time they are hurting themselves.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has been demonstrated that the price of corn is too low to get the corn off the farm. Why does the gentleman want to come

in here and put through a bill that will reduce the price of corn when he already knows that is the reason he is not getting the corn?

Mr. HINSHAW. How high is the price of corn now as compared with 2 years ago? Answer me that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman can answer the question. I did not raise the question.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I am not going to oppose anything that is put before us in the form of a need for food to win the war and sustain our economic life. I am not going to oppose that, but I may say in reference to corn that we have a ceiling price of \$13.75 on hogs. They are talking of lowering that ceiling price, but there are no points on your poultry out there in California or in other sections of the country, although there are high points on our pork. We cannot sell the pork.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint and believe that rationing of pork might very well be lifted entirely until the surplus of pork is used, but may I tell him that the poultry production in the United States, and particularly in my county, is falling off very materially. The reason it has dropped is because we cannot get the feed for one thing, and the second reason is that the feed is so high-priced that our producers cannot afford to feed it to poultry and beef cattle and sell under the ceilings.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman has seen the price raised. He is told that if he gets this bill he will not get any more corn. Why does he want to put himself in a worse shape?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not care so much how we get it, but we do want the corn, and we want it at a fair, reasonable price and not some fancy price that we may have to pay for it in due course.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But just getting up and saying you want the corn is not going to get you the corn.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I sympathize with the gentleman's position, but, remember, corn is between 25 cents and 30 cents a bushel higher now than it was a year ago and it costs the producer of corn 100 percent more to produce it than it did a year ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be true.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my belief, these corn-hog farmers in the Midwest are cutting their own throats with the help of the O. P. A. In the first place the O. P. A. has given them a ceiling price on hogs that is the equivalent of \$1.40 corn. The O. P. A. ceiling on corn is now \$1.16 per bushel, so they are holding corn for hog feed in order to get the \$1.40 value in the form of pork instead of letting the corn be sold to beef and poultry people at \$1.16. The net result is that so much pork is being raised

that the corn-hog farmers are now scared to death for fear the very surplus of pork they have so grown will break the price of pork. So you hear demands for a support price for pork. They are beginning to fear that there will be so much pork that the hogs will even eat up the corn they want to save to feed young pigs next year before the present hog crop can be marketed, so they now recommend the removal of point rationing of pork.

That is all right with me, Mr. Chairman. I favor temporarily, at least, removing the rationing of pork products, and beef too because there are more beef cattle on the ranges unfattened than stockmen can take care of. In fact the whole program is "screwy." In both cases we should hold the consumer ceiling prices, but I think that such tremendous surpluses have been built up by O. P. A. and other restrictions that the prices will go down of themselves when these restrictions have been removed. As I said, I would maintain consumer price ceilings while removing rationing and slaughter restrictions on pork and beef. If something like that is not done soon these animals will eat the farmers and stock raisers out of feed and forage.

The corn-hog farmers have a virtual corner on corn. That corner was engineered when the O. P. A. fixed the ceiling price of pork at higher than the corn-hog ratio warrants after fixing the ceiling price of corn. Now they have the corner on corn and a tremendous surplus of pork that they are not allowed to sell—so they are in a real jam.

But that is not the whole story, Mr. Chairman. The military services, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies, including the O. P. A., have contrived to fill all the storage warehouses in the country to the point that shipments of food to warehouses cannot be unloaded because there is no storage space left, and so there is a tie-up of rail traffic. I submit the following release from the Office of Defense Transportation to prove the point:

RAIL TIE-UP FEARED IN OVERCROWDING OF FOOD STORAGE PLANTS

The Office of Defense Transportation has prepared a report warning that food storage plants are so jammed there is the danger that rail movements will be slowed and that refrigerator cars will remain on sidings unable to unload their cargoes.

Production in food-processing plants already has been slowed as a result of a shortage in storage facilities, admitted by the War Food Administration.

Defense Transportation Director Joseph B. Eastman has called the attention of Food Administrator Marvin Jones and Price Administrator Chester Bowles to the situation and coupled with it a suggestion that some action be taken by the two agencies to relieve the strain on storage facilities.

RATION CUT URGED

O. D. T. storage experts—and presumably Mr. Eastman himself—privately advocate that ration values on certain foods be lowered and that W. F. A. release some of its stored foods as the quickest means to relieve the jam.

A W. F. A. spokesman admitted that both cold and dry storage space was very tight, a condition he attributed to the seasonal

movement of processed foods for winter storage and to increased hog marketings. The Government has large inventories of butter on hand, he said, but this supply now is being reduced as shipments to Russia increase. Butter pledged to that country under lease-lend for the next year is sent during winter months because of Russia's lack of cold storage facilities, he said.

The spokesman insisted there would be no wholesale release of Government-held food stocks, despite recurrent reports from the trade. The Food Distribution Administration is constantly reviewing requirements of various claimants on food stocks, he said, and when an adjustment can be made, supplies are released for civilians.

INSIST ON BACKLOG

Food officials insist on a backlog of supplies, including butter, in order to supply the armed services and lease-lend should their demands suddenly increase, and also to release foods when civilian shortages occur.

Since November 1, the F. D. A. has released from Government stocks the following quantities of foods for civilians:

Peaches, 900,000 cases and more expected; peas, 1,080,000 cases; catsup, 810,000 cases on November 1 and 990,000 cases today; grapefruit juice, 2,400,000 cases; pineapple, 540,000 cases; figs, 77,000 cases; tomatoes, 1,640,000 cases; string beans, 980,000 cases; dried beans, 100,000 bags of 100 pounds each; raisins, approximately 800,000 tons by January 1; dried prunes, about 80,000 tons, and currants, 2,800 tons. F. D. A. also is planning to order a release on canned apples and perhaps canned pork and beans.

Mr. Chairman, in fact this presents a perfectly ridiculous situation. Everyone in California knows that the Government froze and took over the entire fruit pack this year for some reason, and now the Government is releasing hundreds of thousands of cases. It froze butter and other things as well, causing extreme shortages and preventing the action of any part of the law of supply and demand. Hence pressures against ceilings. Hence pressures on unrationed items. Hence reluctance to plant—and withal a general mess of the food situation. It is ridiculous in this land of plenty, even in the midst of war, to so jimmy the machinery of agricultural production and distribution that people go without while farms and warehouses bulge to bursting. The excuse used is that the food must be kept for lend-lease and for the military. The people will do without for both purposes gladly but if the people and the Congress could know the carry-over of surpluses from 1942 crops alone I think they would be amazed. Warehousemen have told me of specific knowledge of conditions in their own warehouses, and there are new large Government warehouses that should be investigated.

Our poultry, dairy, and beef producers in California are in a bad situation, squeezed between rising feed and labor costs on one hand and ceiling prices on the other. They say "What is the use of struggling. We will quit and go into defense work." Thereupon we begin upon a shortage of food. Then the defense workers and all the rest of us stand in line only to be told that there is no more of this or that today. So housewives have to shop far and wide and that

takes gas and gas is rationed too. It doesn't make sense, Mr. Chairman. But then—this is a sample of the planned economy and we may as well sample it now so everyone will know whether we want to keep on with it, or not, after the war. I think—not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this resolution, but for different reasons than most Members. Ordinarily I would be opposed to it in normal times; however, I am interested in securing maximum production of all essential foods during the present war emergency. I want to tell you the main reasons for my supporting this resolution and why I think we should attempt to secure additional feed. It is on account of the announced program of the War Food Administration to cut the production of pork, dairy products, beef cattle, and poultry for next year.

In 1943, this year, the farmers, at the request of the Government, produced 127,000,000 pigs. It takes corn and protein feed to take care of those pigs and to bring them up to a weight of 200 pounds or more. But I am sorry to say that the New Deal never thrives under an abundance of production of necessary foods. If we had an abundance of pork, as we have now, there would be no need for rationing, there would be no need for the threat of inflation, and there would be no need for a high price ceiling. All that is necessary would be a good floor or support price. The officials who are shaping this program or who are shaping the domestic policies of the United States have decided that we have too much pork, so we must cut hog production for 1944 from 127,000,000 head to 105,000,000 head. That will result in less pork. The price will go up, and there will be more of an excuse for a threat to inflation and stricter enforcement of price ceilings.

I want to get corn and other feed for these hogs so that we may have an abundance of the poor man's meat, and that is what pork is, for 1944. They are proposing also to cut down milk production, or to hold it the same as it was in 1942 and 1943.

We have a shortage of milk at the present time. I want to increase the production of milk, butter, and other dairy products, therefore I am supporting this resolution with the hope that it will result in additional feed.

The administration is proposing to cut poultry broilers to 80 percent of what it is this year. Poultry is not on the ration list at the present time. Of course, they would like to ration poultry or bring about a situation where poultry must be rationed, and in order to do this they must create a scarcity of poultry. I want to secure additional feed to take care of the large poultry flocks of this country. They also propose with reference to beef, range cattle, and feeder cattle, that this livestock be marketed at 95 percent of

the 1942 weight, thereby getting less beef on the market and resulting in additional regimentation and in additional threats to inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the time has come when the people, or the Congress speaking for the people, should assert itself and demand maximum production of all types of feed, grains, livestock, and poultry in this country to take care of our needs and in order to stop this inflationary threat that is constantly appearing in the picture. Furthermore, if we create an abundance there will be no need for consumer subsidies which certain groups are insisting on at the present time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman suggest a way in which we can get some corn on the Pacific coast with which to feed our flocks?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] said that if corn were raised to \$1.20 it would bring out the corn from Iowa. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Let me continue along the line of corn. Some of our intellectuals are proposing that we feed the corn and proteins directly to the people instead of feeding them through poultry and livestock; in other words, that we perfect a synthetic product made up of protein feeds and corn and sell it to the people as meat or poultry instead of as the red meat itself.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The Gaumnitz report states beans and peas as a substitute for milk and dairy products and meat products. That is the intention.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. We all know they have perfected a synthetic product called oleomargarine. That may be a good nutrition food, but it is not in the class, chemically or otherwise, with butter.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is the same kind of diet the Japs eat. I do not know why it should be advocated over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken on what is to me a very interesting turn. I think perhaps we are trying out some of our emotions and trading principles and economic thoughts with respect to the job that lies ahead of us.

Germany moves out of first place in Europe, down to a nonentity. Russia moves into first position. Under the decree, Japan is to cease to function in Asia, and China moves into first position. The British Empire takes third position, and the United States moves into first as far as the world is concerned. So in due course, if that program is to be worked out, we shall have a lot of discussions having to do with tariffs and the removal of protection. World power

position No. 1 carries a lot of international responsibilities.

We have a situation here today where corn is being debated. If we take the duty off corn for 90 days and throw the Argentine market open, I wish somebody would tell me in certain language how much corn would come in from there. We might see 50,000,000, 75,000,000, or 150,000,000 bushels of corn offered. I do not know what is produced in Argentina and I do not know how quickly they would unload in order to prepare their bins for the forthcoming crop. When you start removing tariffs on the American market and throwing this market open to the traders of the world, if boats are available you might see something that would surprise you.

I understand from our corn friends here that there is a lot of corn in this country, but what power is there to make those who own that corn throw it on the market at \$1.16 per bushel, or \$1.20 per bushel, or \$1.50 per bushel, or \$3 per bushel, if they prefer to have corn than have credits in the bank or currency in the box? That is what you are really getting at. You give me a reason why a farmer should sell corn today if he wants to feed it or if he thinks the market may advance 50 or 100 percent, or if he thinks the buying power of the dollar he would get for that bushel of corn may decline 25 or 50 percent.

Mr. JENSEN rose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman from Iowa want to answer that question?

Mr. JENSEN. I want to make the observation that in the State of Iowa we need about 90 percent, and feed about 90 percent of everything we raise. That is one thing a lot of folks do not realize. We are the greatest pork-producing State in the Nation, the greatest poultry-producing State in the Nation, and the greatest finished-beef-producing State in the Nation, and naturally we have to feed a lot of that corn.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that. Now, can the gentleman, as an expert on corn and coming from a corn State—

Mr. JENSEN. I do not claim to be an expert.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell me where there is any corn for sale of consequence?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anybody that can tell me where there is any corn for sale of consequence? I am not talking about stocks of corn, I am talking about corn for sale—two different things entirely.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know of any corn for sale; I do not know of any cottonseed oil cake or soybean meal or peanut meal, of consequence, for sale. How much there is in the country I do not know. But what power do you have to make our people, who are presently free economic agents, disgorge those inventories they have? We do not have any such power the President dare politically use, and I do not think this Con-

gress is going to pass a law which says to a man that he has to convert corn into currency or into bank balances in the form of deposits to his credit.

So then you come on down to this proposition. Do we want to throw the market open for Argentine corn for 90 days, or say to the world, "Let the trading world figure out its own way of getting the corn here"? That is what is involved in this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. An order is being contemplated down in the War Food Administration under the War Powers Act, which gives the Government virtual power to seize protein feeds. One official told me that he thought under that War Powers Act they also have the authority to go out and seize corn upon the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the remark of the gentleman from Iowa, if they cannot let that corn go from the State of Iowa because they want to feed animals there, how are we going to get any corn on the west coast, when we need it as badly as they do?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You will have to go without, because you do not raise corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. We are not going to do without, we are going to get it if we can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not blame you at all, the least bit. I would do the same thing.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman asked how they would get the power to take the corn. They can take it under the exact same powers under which early this year they took all the corn contained in 16 terminal elevators.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is all right; in other words, under the war powers.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If they have the war power to do these things and the corn is available, why do they not proceed to do it instead of destroying the protective fabric from a tariff standpoint? That brings me right down to this point. We sit around here and play with O. P. A. and apparently from the debate today let O. P. A. distort and practically destroy the economy of this country. Why do we do it? Why do we move into a field of this kind, as illustrated by this resolution, if the thing

could be corrected by war powers or by changing the attitude of the O. P. A.? That is the kind of question that is in my mind. If it is impossible for the Office of Defense Transportation or the War Powers Division of the Government or the O. P. A. to do anything about it, that is a different proposition. Perhaps we have to go to some other parts of the world to get some of the excess inventories of foodstuffs for animals and people that they have available for sale at the present time. Apparently we are pursuing that particular course, to go get something and bring it into this country.

Suppose you have an armistice within 90 days, then do you want this statute on the books at that time? I do not think so. But if you have 4 more years of war, you may want to extend this 90-day period to 90 months. God only knows how badly we will want food and foodstuffs if we keep on shipping it out of this country the way we are now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the present time the Government is shipping out of the country protein feeds we need here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I refer to the 90-month period.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a mighty high regard for the gentleman's capacity to sift the kernels from the chaff. Now, is the gentleman in favor of this resolution? I have been trying to figure out the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been sitting here trying to figure out in my own mind whether or not I am in favor of it. I have about come to the conclusion, as a result of the debate, that this resolution is not necessary. I wish somebody would get up here and convince me it is necessary. If it is, I will support it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that this country has been engaged in a major war. I do not know whether it is necessary, of course, to send the amount of food we are sending to other parts of the world or not. There is no question but what food plays a very psychological part in a war. I remember very well talking with Mr. Clemenceau during the First World War in which he made this statement. It was in the latter part of 1917. He said:

If the French people knew that we had only 3 days' supply of wheat in the country, the war would cease. The morale of the people would be broken.

That was the day when they were defending, as you know, the city of Verdun. But within 3 days shiploads of wheat came to France. Otherwise it is hard to tell what the history of the world might have been today. Now our men are fighting on at least 50 different fronts. None of us can stand here very well and say that the food that is going out to those fronts should not go there. I suppose that in this war, long before it is over, food will be the greatest factor in the ultimate result, and we are all figuring, of course, on victory. If you read the morning paper you saw there a statement that in order to start this second front in Holland or Belgium or Norway or somewhere over there, it would require 80 divisions, and that of that 80 divisions England could only supply 24 divisions. Just think of the volume of food that must flow 3,000 miles in that direction. Think of the amount of food that must flow in the other direction into Italy, where they are still a long way from Rome. They are not even a third of the way up. They are fighting in the mountains and the snow. Every ounce of food our men are going to have must go some 3,000 miles.

Now the time has come, gentlemen, when there is a question here of how to get food in order to save these great war industries, for the farms are war industries, so that they can supply the basic needs not only of this generation, but of the generations to come. You cannot afford to go out and destroy those plants. What we need in the country today is unity among the farmers. Just because you do not happen to like this resolution a little I do not want to see the farmers of one section line up and vigorously oppose something that will be of benefit to another section. That is not unity. That is not the way to play the game. If we of the East and the Northeast have ever taken the position we are going to cripple you in the West, I do not know when that has been. I have never intended to cast a vote that would do that. I think this bill ought to go through. I do not object, of course, to the corn amendment; in fact, I am for it. There may be other things that ought to go into the bill that may have been overlooked, and we cannot provide for every conceivable situation that may arise. But if we go on trying to supply the world with food and supply enough food for our own people to protect the health of this country, there is no telling but what we may have to draw on many parts of the world, although if the O. P. A. would step to one side, the farmers could and would meet the food problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, our farmers do have a nice reserve of corn and that corn reserve is rapidly being depleted because of the bungling of the O. P. A. The O. P. A. as yet require you to

submit points when you go to market to buy pork. Many, many suburban residents have been accustomed each year at this time to go to the farmer and buy a butchered hog or one to butcher themselves. But they do not have the points today to do that under the rationing system. The markets are glutted, the packing houses and storehouses are filled with pork and beef and there is no place to market fat hogs. The result is that farmers are holding them for months after they have been ready for market and are feeding them today the corn they had hoped to have left to feed their next spring's crop of pigs to make pork for another year. That is happening all over the country. It is happening in my district and it is happening in your district. I have today introduced a bill putting meat on the free-point list, doing away with the rationing of meat for 60 days, which I am told by members of the Farm Bureau and all the farm organizations, would be the best step we could take, today, to alleviate the situation of glutted markets and help conserve our corn supply for the feeding of pork for next year's meat crop. We all recognize the fact that the most efficient machine in the world for changing corn over to proteins and fats is the hog. We must have a large crop of pigs next spring to ensure an adequate supply of proteins and fats for use another year. The farmers are not going to raise pigs unless they have corn on hand with which to feed them.

They are not going to raise those pigs unless they can get rid of the pork they have on hand today. You people who are interested in getting corn and conserving the corn supply which we have, should get behind me on this bill which I have introduced today to take meat off the ration list for at least 60 days.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman states there is an impending shortage of corn which the farmers can feed the pigs next spring. What does he think will happen in the great Northeast if farmers cannot get corn now and have not been able to get it for months in order to maintain the dairy herds and the poultry flocks, unless a bill of this kind becomes law?

Mr. WILSON. Unless my bill becomes law, this corn that you might have an opportunity to get will be fed to already fattened hogs and will be wasted. The only way you can hope to get corn that we have now is to get rid of the hogs that the farmers are feeding the corn to, and then they might be able to turn a little over to you people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They may be; but in the meantime, if we suffer the same conditions we have for the last couple of months, they will wipe out the dairy herds in the entire northeastern section of this country.

Mr. WILSON. I am not speaking against this bill or for it. I am simply offering you one step which you may take toward a solution of your problem. Am

I not correct in my observation that this will tend to give you some corn?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you dispose of the present stocks of meat by putting them free of rations, and then proceed to bring in more hogs through propagation to consume corn, I do not know but what you will reduce your potential stocks of corn. If the program is as announced by the gentleman from Minnesota, to the effect that next year the hog and poultry and beef production is to be decreased, I do not see how it fits into the gentleman's proposal, and I certainly do not see how such a reduction-in-production program can possibly fit in with the observations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], wherein he points out that we have got to send 15 divisions of men across the channel to fight, with all these other undertakings. So this debate today is quite confusing. Because of that thing, we say that the Government is going to reduce production.

On the other hand, we must conserve the feed to increase production, and so on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a short statement out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the House knows that under the program the Speaker was to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon. On account of other matters on the program and the debate on this bill, I will yield to the Speaker 15 minutes tomorrow when we call up the naval bill, and he will address the Committee at that time for 15 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House provides for the lifting or waiving of tariff on agricultural commodities including wheat imported from foreign countries. The reason given by the sponsors of the measure is that it may help to take care of an acute feed shortage in this country. If I thought this legislation would increase the supply of feed in this country and thereby provide for more food, I would be glad to support it.

I have made some investigation of this problem. I am informed by officials in the Department of Agriculture dealing with this question that the Commodity Credit Corporation is at the present time buying just as much feed, including wheat, as transportation facilities will permit. It ought to be definitely understood that under our present law the Commodity Credit Corporation has authority to buy wheat and other feeds anywhere in the world and in any amount without tariff restrictions. Not only that, but the Commodity Credit Corporation has been furnished funds by the Federal Government with which to

do it. There can be no reason why we should not receive just as much feed products as foreign countries will let us have with our transportation facilities to bring it into this country. Transportation is the bottleneck in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, under this resolution wheat imported from Canada will cost from 15 cents to 20 cents per bushel more than it does now. The additional cost, known as an equalization fee, will go to the Canadian farmers. They are permitted to charge it on wheat sold to individuals, but not when sold to the American Government. It has been suggested on the floor of the House that this legislation would help increase the production of food. As I have said before, if I thought this were correct, I would certainly support it. We are all agreed that we must have a maximum production of food. No one is opposed to that. We will support legislation that will anyway increase food supplies. Food is necessary for the winning of this war and food will have a lot to do with the winning of the peace. If this administration wants to encourage the increase in the supply of food, it ought to give consideration to two or three fundamental things—first, it ought to assure the farmer a fair price for his products in the market place on the basis of what he has to pay for the things he needs to buy. The farmer and producer must have machinery and equipment so he can carry on his farm operations to a maximum. We must see that he gets his fair share of help as he goes along and give him some assurance that there will not be any roll-backs in the prices for his commodities when they are ready for the market. We must give the farmer to understand that his services are appreciated as a part of this war effort.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about increasing supplies of feed and yet it was only a little more than a year ago we were reducing farm acreage in this country and holding down feed and food production. Farmers were penalized as much as 49 cents per bushel for raising a little more wheat than departmental regulations allowed. These farmers were not only penalized on the extra wheat they raised, and may have fed to their own livestock but they did not get parity checks nor soil-conservation payments. They did not ask for them, but did think they were entitled to sell their wheat without penalty especially when it was so much needed.

Mr. Chairman, this Government collected \$17,877,000 in penalties from the farmers of this country who raised about thirty-five or forty million bushels of wheat that was in excess of the amount they were allowed under the Allotment Act. Today we are talking about thirty-five or forty million bushels of wheat that is being brought in from Canada with a 40-cent bushel tariff, but we hesitate to reimburse those farmers for the penalties they have paid just because they saw fit to raise the extra wheat that is so much needed at the present time.

LXXXIX—680

Mr. Chairman, this \$14,000,000 is not tax money. It is penalty money that ought to be refunded to the farmers who paid the penalties. They are entitled to it.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago I introduced a bill in this House to reimburse those penalty payments. The committee to which it was referred has taken no action on it. A petition has been placed on the Clerk's desk to discharge the committee and bring the bill to the floor of the House for vote. I trust those of you who believe this measure is at least entitled to be considered by the House, will sign the petition so we can vote on it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I feel that the gentleman's bill should be reported and passed to relieve these penalties, because we did waive the penalty on those who had not paid it.

I also favor what the gentleman said about increasing farm machinery so we can have an increased production next year, but in the meantime what are we going to feed the cows, especially the milk cows?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota. If I thought this legislation would materially increase the supply of needed livestock feeds in this country I would support it during an emergency. I want to relieve the dairyman and the poultrymen of New England and South Dakota, and everywhere else. We already have legislation permitting the importation of wheat and protein products for feeding livestock, and have authorized funds for doing it for emergency purposes.

Mr. CASE. Why not try it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I certainly would be glad to try it if I thought it would really relieve the feed situation in an emergency. This measure does not, in my judgment, solve either the feed or the food problem. The difficulty on this particular situation is one of transportation and distribution. Our Government is importing all the essential feed transportation facilities will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, one thing I have noticed in Congress that causes more trouble in our country than almost anything else is that we are all afraid to vote against a bill that bears a label saying it will remedy something we know is wrong, even though the bill will not remedy it at all. When such a bill is presented to us we stand up and vote against it when we know it will do no good; we stand with shaking knees, afraid to vote against a

bad bill with a good label for fear of the effect it will have back home and the fact that our opponents may use it against us.

It seems to me this bill is tinged with a good deal of sectionalism. The people in the Midwest know what it is necessary to do to get more corn. They are going to feel that this is a sectional bill. From their point of view, it is a sectional bill because it will do nothing but appease some section; this Congress, the country having fought one sectional war, ought to be very careful not to vote for legislation that will not do the thing it is supposed to do but will merely stir up sectional feelings.

When you consider this bill, ask yourselves whether you would vote for an amendment to this bill which would make this bill fair to all sections. The following amendment would be consistent with the bill as written: That the provisions of this bill shall apply to all commodities or articles which are rationed or of which there is likely to be a shortage, so that it would apply to clothing and everything else, in New England and everywhere else. That would be perfectly consistent.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. After I have completed my statement I shall be pleased to yield.

O. P. A. is the reason for this bill.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Just O. P. A. and nobody else. You people who raise corn, you know what is wrong. A lot of farmers do not keep books, particularly the smaller ones. On our farm we keep books. I am telling you we cannot replace the corn in the bins on our farm today at present prices. Why should you bring in a bill that causes dumping at lower prices to reduce the price of corn when it has already been demonstrated to everybody's satisfaction, even O. P. A., that the price of corn has been too low to bring corn to the market? What reason is there? What reason is there for you to hold up the hands of O. P. A. that they can make worse mistakes? This bill repeals the correction of the mistake they had made with respect to corn. It repeals the recent raise of the price of corn.

We need a higher price for corn. One dollar and sixteen cents is not enough. You and all of your constituents are paying \$1.40 for corn in the shape of hogs. You are all paying that, as I said, when you buy pork. That is what we want to pay for corn. Why the O. P. A. should say you cannot pay for corn the same as you pay when you buy hogs is not explained. There is no reason for it. Nobody has given you a reason. If the corn price were raised now before we make our program next year, we will give you millions of bushels of additional corn. You know what is going to happen when you get corn in here at a lower price. If the price of corn were higher, all of us on our farms would

find a few more acres to put to corn. With a higher price for corn you southerners would find some acres to put into corn. Those southerners sitting over there are your witnesses.

What is going to happen when you get a lower price? You know what they are doing with their foreign policy, and I refer to you members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. They are having a lot of trouble with Argentina right now. That is the only country they have not been able to reach with a checkbook. Here is a chance to get Argentina and give them our corn market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious question. Do you think this is temporary? Have you stopped to consider that when we emerge from this war we are going to have at least \$25,000,000,000 more in factories in this country which want to export, that there is a terrific drive on to export, and concomitant with that is the thought that you cannot export without importing? What do you think they are going to import? You know they are not going to import automobiles, and you know they are not going to import manufactured articles right away. Why do you think they are letting Russia take control of Europe at the expense of Poland, which was our first ally, Latvia, Estonia, and all the rest of those republics over there? Do you know why they are doing that? They want to sell machinery to Russia. What else do they have to do in order to sell to Russia, Europe, and the rest of the world this added machinery they are going to produce? Why, they have to get the farming industry out of America. They have to give the American farm market to China and other countries and they will ship foreign farm products into the South and into the North of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, when a bill like this is brought in, we are just starting to open the door for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 11 words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the debate has gone far afield from the resolution that is supposed to be under consideration. Let us get back. I imagine the primary purpose of this resolution is to increase food for the production of poultry, livestock, and so forth. My own State is a heavy producer not only of livestock but of wheat. I do not know why wheat should be included in this resolution. We have a tremendous surplus of wheat in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from a letter written by a constituent in a small town in Montana. The following lan-

guage is included in this letter, and I may say I know the writer personally:

Nearly every farmer south of Flaxville—

That is a little town down toward the eastern end of the State—

had a pile of 10,000 bushels of wheat or more out on the ground. The elevators there are plugged with wheat.

The farmers have no place to store their wheat, as they have been unable to build granaries and the result is that this grain is lying out on the ground in many instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wish the gentleman would tell the difficulty he has had to get sufficient boxcars into eastern Montana in order to take care of the wheat which could not go into the warehouses or elevators, and which was lying on the ground.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out. It is impossible to get sufficient cars to market this wheat. It is referred to in another letter I have from the Farmers Educational Cooperative Union in Roosevelt County, in which the following is stated:

DEAR SIR: I listened to a commentator from Canada the other evening who was telling that Canada was getting rid of all her surplus wheat, as they have got such a good market for it in the United States.

Yet this bill would take the tariff off of wheat.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. In view of the fact boxcars have been mentioned and the difficulty of securing them, may I say that the Commodity Credit Corporation is doing everything in its power to get all the boxcars available to Canada in order to get the grain out of there before the winter sets in. That is the reason you cannot get rid of your grain.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have had it up with every department we can think of in Washington trying to get cars and we cannot get them. Our elevators are still plugged with wheat and wheat is still on the ground, yet we are asked to take the tariff off of wheat so the Canadians can ship some more in here.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In a moment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall yield later on. Now, get this, and I may say incidentally that this is the commentator speaking over in Canada this man is referring to:

And the housewife and farmers can buy anything they want made from steel as there is no shortage of steel any more. What is wrong here? We cannot sell a bushel of wheat as the elevators are always plugged. Those close to town get rid of some of their wheat when they could get a car. When they live 30 miles out they could not get any of

their wheat into the car because the car would be filled before they got to town; cars were so scarce.

Then this goes on:

Are we here just to help other nations—

He is one of the farmers of this country. I want to say to you ladies and gentlemen that sooner or later he is one who is going to be called upon to pay this tax bill of over \$300,000,000,000. You cannot go to Canada or anywhere else and get this money. You are going to get it out of these farmers and others in this country. How are you going to make the bonds worth anything? The people of the United States are the ones who will have to pay, not the people in foreign nations. You have got to look after your own people to some extent and not run hog wild. You should not bring this wheat in here when you have a surplus of it already. American markets should belong as far as possible to the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this letter goes on to say:

And let our own Nation go to —?

I do not know what word he wanted to put in there, but I can guess.

I am doing all I can in helping in all the relief and bond drives that we have. We have a class out here who will not buy a bond or give a nickel to relief. I have three boys in the services fighting for this class of people. What kind of democratic crazy stuff do we call this, to let this stuff in here with a surplus unprecedented in this country on the ground, in the elevators, and in the cars?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished colleague that I cannot see what that has to do with the present resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What are you doing with wheat in this resolution? Why do you want wheat in this resolution if it is not affected?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is nothing in this resolution in regard to wheat that has not already been in operation by the present administration ever since the 29th day of last April. This is rather a late day to tell us all the bad things that are happening. We have had ever since the 29th of April to bring out these points. The importation of wheat has been between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels. We produce some 900,000,000 bushels in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman wants to bring more of it in here, duty free, with our wheat rotting on the ground in Montana and in North and South Dakota?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That wheat is used for a different purpose altogether. This is feed wheat.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know, that is what you say, but this wheat will find its way into the elevators and mills, too, and these people will come over here, just as this man points out in this letter, because they will find such good markets in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the last few days we have had before our Committee on Insular Affairs testimony that we are using 10,000,000 bushels of grain per month for the production of commercial alcohol, instead of getting the ships into the Caribbean Sea areas to bring blackstrap molasses up here to be converted into commercial alcohol. There is another 120,000,000 bushels of grain we can pick up right there, if we want to cut off this grain conversion.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. As I understand, we are shipping large quantities of flour under lend-lease to Europe. I understand that now we are bringing in large quantities of wheat from a part of that same kingdom and grinding it and giving it to another part. It looks to me as if there is a double expenditure of American funds.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the first place, we ought to grind our own wheat, we ought to relieve our own people here of the surplus of wheat we have in this country before we let in wheat from other countries, some regard must be had for the American producer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 13 words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is a rather simple proposition with which we are confronted here this afternoon. I can bring you very definitely the word that as far as both the dairy farmers and the poultry farmers in my section of the country are concerned they are in great need of feed of every sort. I can tell you that the development of our farm animals has been markedly retarded, that it takes longer to bring our hens into production than it did before, because of the shortage of feed. This means costs of production are increased and prices which might otherwise be fair and equitable are no longer enough to cover costs.

I think it is important that that feed be gotten to the farmers who need it in the most expeditious manner in which it can be done under present circumstances. As was suggested by the speech of the gentleman from Montana that we just listened to, the problem is largely a problem of transportation. I do not want to go into a lot of detail in a pub-

lic address about certain things, but it is true that there is such a thing as water transportation, which in some instances is a readier means of getting large bulk quantities of things from one place to another than is land transportation. As far as we in California are concerned, that happens to be an important element.

It seems to me I would be failing in my duty to the farmers I represent if I were not in support of this measure. I feel that the gentleman from Wisconsin has done the right thing in pressing this resolution. Indeed, I am rather encouraged to find that there are so many Members on the Republican side who are advocating this measure. I believe it is indicative of the fact that there come times when we simply have to recognize the fact that there is logic in the contention that reduction of tariff duties may be of benefit to agriculture. It is my personal opinion, in listening to the gentleman from Illinois make her speech, that on balance and through the years it is very questionable how much good high tariffs have done to agriculture as a general proposition. I am not one who can say he is a complete free trader. I think protection in some instances is no doubt necessary. But on balance the tariff certainly has benefited industry rather than agriculture in the history of this country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know the gentleman is interested in the welfare of agriculture, and we in California have naturally suffered from a lack of opportunity to produce feeds. I wonder if the gentleman knows at this time or if any other Member can tell us what the attitude of the Farm Bureau is on this particular legislative proposal.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not able to speak for the Farm Bureau, and I hesitate to venture comment on that organization's attitude. I will say that I have been given to understand that they are favorably inclined to this bill. I know they did not appear before the committee against the bill, for I am told that no one did so. I should like some other Member who may have direct word from them to answer that question more factually than I can, because I cannot answer it factually. They have not communicated with me, and I have no right to speak for them.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish simply to say that this bill, as I conceive it, is a means of expediting the shipment of grain that we desperately need in certain portions of this country. Our livestock population is tremendously greater than it has ever been before. Relative to that livestock population our feed supplies are short. I have been in receipt of letters only in the last couple of days from poultry associations in my own section and in other sections of my State which present in factual detail the effect of this problem of the feed shortage upon their attempts to carry on their business.

Since this measure will help to bring that feed to the farmers who need it and will help to bring it in at a more reasonable cost, it seems to me that with the present overwhelming demand for feed, a demand far greater than the total supply, this is the most reasonable thing for the Congress to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The particular amendment just now is the one on corn. It has been several times asked on this floor how we are going to get corn in the country, in California, and in the East, where they need it. They can get corn from Argentina by paying the price. They have gotten a lot of it and are getting it from Argentina and are paying the tariff on it. Argentina is competing with the farmers from Illinois and Iowa and elsewhere who are raising corn. When one says, "We have got to have feed," of course, you have to pay for it. And you will not pay any more than you ought to when you get it from Iowa or Illinois.

Argentina! Argentina! Yes. Do you know of any boys from Argentina that are fighting for your freedom? Do you know what Argentina is doing to you in this World War? Favor Argentina if you want to, and then go out and ask the people of the Middle West to support tariffs again, when you are taking away the very thing that the East has always had. Strike agriculture except when you want its vote.

Now, to speak about corn. Next year in my State the acreage for corn has been increased by 6 percent and there will be corn there. Oats have been decreased somewhat, but the acreage for corn has been increased that much. The acreage for soybeans, which is a great feed for you, has been increased. But you do not want to pay for it. You want to despoil my people and the people from the farms for your feed. That is all there is to this. There is nothing else. You can pay this tariff and then get the feed at reasonable prices. In Iowa at the present time, I have it from a reputable source, there are 75,000,000 bushels of Iowa corn available for movement out of Iowa right now into commercial channels, but they have not moved it because they can make more money by feeding hogs. Oh, we were fools, were we not, to save our corn so we could make more money? Penalize us for that, will you? Then go out and ask us to vote for a tariff again, will you? Penalize us because we want to sell our corn to the best advantage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman this question. You are from Iowa. You know farming. I have lived in your district out there, and I know your people. A good Iowa farmer grows corn and converts it into proteins on the

farm through feeding the animals and putting the fertilizer back on the soil and thus maintains the productivity of his soil, does he not?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not that the way to grow foodstuffs?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes; that is right. I am talking of a way to grow foodstuffs. Take the tariff off every product the farmer has in the Middle West, so that the fellow down East, in Maine, and elsewhere, can get things cheaply. We have been supporting their ideas about tariffs for generations back in Iowa, when we commenced voting for them. This year we had 648,000,000 bushels of corn disappear from Iowa farms and, my friends, that is greater than an all-time record and it is as great as our whole production of corn in that State. Now, that refutes any charge that we are hoarding corn. We are using it. We are doing the best we can with it. All there is to this bill, as I see it, is, that certain people want to get our corn just as cheaply as they can without paying the tariff rates. They import corn from Argentina to the Pacific coast and have been doing it in opposition to our corn and have been laying it down there at a cheaper price than we can.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I will yield for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the gentleman's opinion how much would corn have to be raised to start it moving to the markets where it is most needed now outside of his own State?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not know. I have said I thought the corn would leave the State whenever you make it so it would be more profitable to sell it than to keep it, and you would have to get about \$1.20 for corn there to prevent it from being fed to hogs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is a point that is overlooked on this corn problem. The cost of production of corn, as the cost of production of wheat, has gone up in the last year from 50 percent to 75 percent.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Certainly, that is so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is one reason why you have to have a greater price for corn in order to cause it to move.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And it has not gone up in Argentina.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If you look at the October "Crops and Markets" you will find today cows have produced more pounds of milk than they have at any other time, notwithstanding the fact that you folks say there is a shortage of feed. You talk about the lend-lease. All right. If Canada is raising this stuff, why not let Canada send it to their compatriots on the battle fronts? Let them take it. Let Great Britain take it from

its own Canada instead of taking it from our farmers. If, as is proposed by the lady from Illinois, this is only to get feed, then why do you not import the products from Canada? Why do you not get butter from Canada? Why do you not get milk from Canada? Instead of having this roundabout way of going around the Cape of Good Hope with the corn and feeding it to the cows so that the cows can produce milk or the cows can produce butter? Oh, no, you want to have the benefit of the tariff yourself and not allow the farmers of this country to profit by it except when it is to your own interest. You ask us to support the tariff idea. Now, you can support farm grain. You can pay for corn at reasonable prices and get it from America if you want to. There is no shortage of corn if you pay for it or of feed if you are willing to pay for it. But you have now a chance to despoil the farmers of this country. Well, it is a long lane that has no turn. The American market should belong to the American farmer and not to the peons from the plains and pampas of Patagonia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 14 words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt there is a serious shortage of stock feed in this Nation. However, it appears to me that this legislation is treating the effect rather than the cause. While we are discussing what brought about the condition which the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] has pointed out so forcefully, we are also trying to do a little face saving for the O. P. A. In my opinion, the reason for this shortage is simple. It is caused by the fact that upon the farms of America today are millions of head of livestock which, through the regular procedure, without Government regulation, would now be processed and stored were it not for the fact that the Army and Lend-Lease, through its overpurchasing, have loaded up every cold-storage warehouse in the Nation to the roof. In an effort to cover up we find them shipping hundreds of cars of frozen foods to the public institutions of the various States, foods which they have overpurchased and are now frantically working to dispose of in an effort to make room in the cold-storage warehouses of this country for incoming products.

Word has gone out from the War Food Administration pleading with the agriculturalists of the country to hold their livestock on the farm and not glut the markets. Why? Because there is not room in the cold-storage warehouses to store it. Each day that livestock remains on the farm it is consuming additional grain, the grain which you so badly need. Do we know what the solution is? At least we think we do.

There must be a relaxing in the point system so that consumers will have an opportunity to purchase meat products, as they have through the years. The longer this livestock is held on the farms, the more feed it will consume. We know

that the glut is in the market because of overstocked cold-storage warehouses of the country, and any Member of Congress can check up in his respective district and find these warehouses loaded to the roofs with products overpurchased by the Army, Navy, and other governmental purchasing agencies. Now that these products are purchased, transportation is not available to move them; neither is there a place to consume them other than at the tables of American homes.

Another cause of overstocking is that the same ration points are used in the purchase of butter that are used in the purchase of meat. As the result, a family with three or four small children needing a plentiful supply of butter cannot purchase the proper amount of meat because of the limited number of ration points. Consequently, meat and its products do not move from the warehouse to the consumer. The farmer cannot take his pig to market, because the butcher has no place to put it, as the warehouses are already full. The result is the consumer does without meat, the little pig stays home, and instead of being eaten, he consumes the feed that is so badly needed to meet the shortage that now exists throughout the country.

The O. P. A. has admitted their error in part by relaxing the point system to some extent, but until such time as they liberalize the point system still further and afford the people an opportunity to purchase additional meat products, you will have a continued glutting of the market.

I contend that the Commodity Credit Corporation can bring feed into this Nation, if it so desires, without this legislation. I had an opportunity to look over an agreement entered into by the Department of Agriculture and the Government of Peru, the Commodity Credit Corporation acting as agent, in which this country agrees to purchase 200,000 bales of cotton annually from Peru. This was the estimated production of 135,000 hectares of land. The unusual thing about the agreement was that we agreed to increase the price $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent for each 1 percent of acreage reduced. Reductions in acreage were permitted up to 30 percent. This would mean that for each \$1 worth of cotton purchased, we would pay \$1.45. I thought we had gotten rid of the system in this country of plowing under every third row. It seems we have merely moved the system to South America. I am wondering if similar contracts are in effect in other parts of the Americas applying to grain, the shortage of which we are now trying to overcome.

We do not have to leave this country to solve this problem. Modify the point system to the extent that it will permit the American public to purchase the meat they need for their families and thus relieve the congestion in our cold storage warehouses. The stock that is now being held by the farmer will move to the market and stop consuming the corn and other feed so badly needed in the East and along the west coast.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As an incident of the thing of which you speak, last week on our farm, we sent a truckload of hogs to Chicago. They could not receive it. We had to bring it back home and we are still feeding corn to those hogs that were past the feeding stage. If the ration points had been released the people could have purchased that pork. They could have put it into the iceboxes and kept it.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Your case is typical of hundreds of thousands of others throughout the Nation. Such conditions have created the present dilemma in which we find ourselves. Until the present stock of products in cold storage is moved, thus providing space for incoming crops, this condition will continue. Although the Army and Navy and Lend-Lease purchases have created this blockade, only the O. P. A. can correct it. Its solution lies in the easing of the ration point system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I wish to state in the beginning that this is a very important step in the wrong direction. It is a step to sell the American farmer permanently down the river. It is the first step to sell the farmers' domestic markets to foreigners. As usual, you begin by saying you are going to sell his markets for just 90 days. I am not surprised at my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], starting in with 90 days. He knows that the American farmer would not stand for him selling their markets permanently at one time. But at the end of 90 days he will come back with an extension of 90 days, and then with another extension of 90 days. He will continue to ask for extensions until the farmers' domestic markets will be permanently sold to foreign farmers. We are already exporting more tractors per capita to Canada than we are selling to our own people.

Now, let us find out whether it is a case of shortage. My friend from Wisconsin should know, because he used to be one of the wet nurses for triple A. That is where the trouble began. They asked the farmer to reduce his acreage of corn from 104,000,000 to 86,000,000. Then the Lord Almighty interposed and reduced it to 80,000,000 by floods. Then the triple A came along and fined the farmer 49 to 57 cents a bushel for wheat that he planted 8 months before the law was passed. They extorted \$15,000,000 from the American farmers—and I say extorted deliberately—in fines and penalties. There is the cause of part of your shortage.

Take the triple A from our necks and abolish the O. P. A. and the American farmer will take care of the American people. That is all you have to do. Now, let us see where we are. First, the triple A reduced corn acreage from 104,-

000,000 acres to 86,000,000, and the Lord reduced it to 80,000,000. Next the triple A fined the farmer \$15,000,000 for producing wheat and compelled him to restrict production of other valuable crops. Then the triple A reversed itself and asked the farmers to increase the hog production 20 percent. The farmers obey. Then they come along and tell him he should sell his corn in place of feeding it to the hogs that they asked the mother pigs to give birth to. They ought to have Mrs. Sanger around. That is exactly the situation.

I am astonished by my Republican friends. They do not see far enough ahead; they have just the tip of their nose to look at. They want to be for protection one day and for free trade the next. My friends, you are not going to go far in the next election, do not mistake me, if you begin now to sell the American farmer's market first and then say you could not help it because somebody faked and told us you needed a little feed. There is plenty of feed in the country. What you need is transportation and less red tape.

Let us see what the situation is. This resolution if passed will not bring in 1 additional bushel of corn or 1 ton of hay. All you are doing is subsidizing the Canadian and Latin-American countries by paying them an addition equal to the tariff. We are already importing all from them that they have to sell and to spare. Why do I say this? Because of this: I called up one of the departments last week. The person talking to me said it was luncheon time, that he was in the office alone and could talk frankly to me. He said:

Mr. LEMKE, I just recalled before you asked for these protein feeds, the Army called up and wanted 163,000 bushels of oats and 100,000 tons of alfalfa hay for Britain—

Or something like that, I forget the exact quantity.

He said:

I told the Army officer that we were buying oats and hay from Canada and that the Army could get it at the same price, that the British could get it from the same place, that it was their colony. The Army answered: "But you do not know; they have not any lend-lease in Canada."

In other words, you bring this feed in here and then the Canadians get the advantage of the tariff. Your farmers will not get it. Then we sell feed under lend-lease for little or nothing to foreign countries and you easterners will be as bad off as you ever were before in regard to feed.

I have been reliably informed, even this morning, that lend-lease is selling our gasoline to foreign governments at 2 cents a gallon and that they are selling it back to our Army at 42 cents a gallon. Get the difference in price. And by the way, I am informed that what we need is an investigating committee over there from the Committee on Appropriations to find out what is going on, such a committee would get an eye-opener.

What is the object of all of this? It is a part of this "One-World-ism." It is

democratic discipline, I would say to my friend from Wisconsin; and they are going to discipline you so that you will take the yoke and become a good slave and obey their orders. Then we will have one world and try to bring all the Hottentots up to our level but fail and at the same time bring ourselves down to their level. These are facts I want you to bear in mind. A friend of mine said he was flying over those countries at an elevation of 5,000 feet and even at that height he could still smell the stench of lend-lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss SUMNER of Illinois) there were—ayes 97, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: On page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof" strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the importation of wheat for milling purposes."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: On page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That such exemptions shall not apply in the case of any article or product, 1, with respect to which the foreign country from which it is exported has imposed an equalization fee or export tax or charge; or, 2, the price of which in the foreign country from which it is exported has been increased subsequent to 30 days prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that he may proceed for 3 additional minutes in addition to the 5?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone can say I am unsympathetic to the proposition of getting feed to the distressed areas. I do not come from the Corn Belt. As a matter of fact, we have a feed shortage in my territory, and Members of the House will recall that I have at all times supported the proposal for selling feed wheat even when those proposals were opposed by most of the farm organizations and a good many

Members from my own part of the country. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the idea of getting every bushel of feed that we can to the distressed areas. However, I do want to say as strongly as I can that the removal of tariffs on grains as proposed in this bill will not bring a single bushel of feed into this country.

The fact is we have been importing great quantities of feed from Canada and paying the tariff. During this year we have imported more than 100,000,000 bushels of oats and barley from Canada upon which the tariff has been paid, and, in fact, we have imported so much barley that there is now a shortage of barley in Canada, and the Canadian Government has refused to issue any more export permits. We have already taken out of Canada all the barley they have to export and have paid a tariff on it. There is still some oats in Canada, there is still some wheat in Canada, there is still a little hay in Canada which can be imported, but it can be imported just as well, and will be, if we leave the tariff where it is now.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is directed to this proposition: At the present time there is in effect in Canada on barley and oats what is known there as an equalization fee, which is set up under a regular formula. It is the difference between the selling price in Canada and the price in this country less the tariff. If we take the tariff off it means, of course, that by the automatic operation of the formula they will increase the price that we have to pay by the amount of the tariff, so that instead of American farmers getting any benefit from taking off the tariff the money will go to Canadian farmers. It is not going to go into our customs coffers and it is not going into the Federal Treasury, as is the case at the present time. It will go to the Canadian Government and to the farmers of Canada.

My amendment simply provides that this act shall not be effective as to any commodity upon which any foreign government imposes an export tax or an equalization fee or on which it has increased the price within 30 days subsequent to the enactment of this act. There are other countries, of course, besides Canada, from which we could import these products. We are at the present time receiving imports of flax from the Argentine. If Argentina follows the same policy that they did when we put the reciprocal trade agreements with that country into effect, as soon as we remove the tariff they will increase the price of flax to the American purchaser. My amendment would prevent that. It will prevent any country in the world from increasing the price to us by either an equalization fee, an export tax, or a simple increase in price. If the act goes into effect and you adopt my amendment, the American farmer will then get the benefit instead of someone in Canada or Argentina or some other country from which we may import.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In view of the fact that Canada is part of the Western Hemisphere and enjoying the benefits of the good-neighbor policy, the gentleman does not feel the Canadian Government would take advantage of this situation and raise the price of wheat to offset the deduction in the tariff, does he?

Mr. HOPE. The Canadian Government has done that. The Canadian Government has consistently kept in effect this policy of applying an equalization fee. Here is what has actually happened since the present bill was reported by the committee: The Canadian Government has stopped the exportation of these commodities, including wheat, until the outcome of this legislation is determined. They are waiting to see if we pass the bill so that they can raise the price.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Does the gentleman remember that in 1938 Argentina delivered corn in Chicago for 34½ cents a bushel, paying the tariff, because of the difference in exchange in their favor? That difference is far greater now than it was then. If they had the corn and the transportation, they would ship it to us anyway. Just what the gentleman is saying now is the truth. If you pass this, you simply hand Argentina that much more. We buy it, give it in lend-lease to foreign countries, then they will sell it back to us at 100- or 200-percent profit.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I would like to ask about the equalization fee. I understand there is a ceiling on wheat in Canada. What would that be?

Mr. HOPE. I am not sure there is a ceiling on wheat. There is a ceiling on barley and oats.

Mr. DEWEY. Well, on barley.

Mr. HOPE. I have the figures here.

Mr. DEWEY. I do not understand the equalization fee.

Mr. HOPE. I have here a letter from the War Food Administrator in which he states that the Canadian Government has imposed an equalization fee on barley exports to this country which represents the difference between the selling price in Canada and the market price in the United States, less the import duty.

Mr. DEWEY. That answers my question.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's fear is that the increase between the equalization price and the export price will be picked up by the Canadian Government, is that it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Under their formula they may increase the price by the amount of the duty.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One reason we cannot get corn is because our farmers are not given equipment. Much of that equipment has been sent to Argentina, which is not cooperating to any extent in the war program. Does not the gentleman think it is unfair to encourage the importation into the United States of Argentine grain at this time and that we might as well have it here if our farmers were given what the Argentine farmers have been given?

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] thoroughly.

It has been said by other Members, better than I can say it, that if we adopt this resolution today we are simply setting a precedent which is bound to come back and plague us at a later date. It is easy enough to say that we want to get a little feed into the country, therefore we will take the tariff off, and 90 days will be the end of it. But that is not the way those things work out. I do not think we will get any feed under this program, but whether we do or not, we can expect the same arguments to be made for a further extension. Most of the bad legislation which we have on the statute books now was passed to meet some emergency supposed to be temporary in its nature. These emergencies never seem to end, however, and eventually the legislation becomes permanent because vested interests are built up while the temporary legislation is in effect. Let me remind you also, as has been so well stated by the able gentleman from Illinois, what logical reason is there for limiting this to feed? Why not open it up and let us take the duty off of everything which is being rationed at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course the procedure here is to do anything and everything possible to defeat this resolution. That is exactly what this amendment would do. Under the trade agreement with Canada, if we lower the tariff they cannot raise the price. Let us stop this sniping at the people in the East and fighting them in their desperate attempt to get enough feed to save their herds. Amendments can be offered here, of course, and I do not object to that, and would let this debate run on forever if necessary, but let us vote upon the merits of this resolution, not just try to kill it and make this a sectional fight.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The purpose of this resolution is to allow badly needed feed to come into this country for livestock and poultry, for a limited period of 90 days.

Mr. REED of New York. That is all.

Mr. COOPER. The adoption of this amendment would defeat the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. No question about it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. If what the gentleman says is true and if what the gentleman from Tennessee says is true, that there is a provision in the reciprocal trade agreement whereby Canada cannot add to the price the amount we take off in the way of duty, then how is my amendment going to hurt anything so far as Canada is concerned? Is it not a good idea to have it in effect as far as other countries are concerned with which we do not have reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. REED of New York. If we just want to kill the bill by a series of such amendments we can do it, but I think the thing to do is this. We have adopted amendments here which have had merit. I think the time has come when we had better close debate on this amendment and proceed to vote. If the House is against helping the farmers, that is all right, but I am going to help them as long as I have any opportunity to do so with my vote. Of course, as has just been suggested here, the owners of the herds and the poultry people will furnish some market for the wheat of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE), there were—ayes 35, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are about ready to vote on this resolution. I think it has been discussed very thoroughly this afternoon and I am very much pleased that it has been. I do not think we ought to let these resolutions go through without a thorough discussion of them.

As far as I am personally concerned, I expressed my views on this resolution early this afternoon. I am convinced it will not bring in a pound more of grain, that the funds are already available for all we can buy, that the transportation is the difficulty, and that the passage of this resolution will cost the farmers, the livestock feeders, the dairymen, and the poultry producers more money for their grain than they are paying at the present time, the reason being that we are going to remove these tariffs and open up the competition not to the Federal Government alone as the purchaser of feed grains for our people but to anyone who wants to go across the borders or into any country on the face of the earth and buy this grain.

As to this equalization fee, I think we should keep in mind that we have a 42-cents-a-bushel tariff on wheat. If they purchase 150,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada from October 1, 1943, to October

1, 1944—and that is what they are planning to do—it means \$65,000,000 in equalization fees for wheat, which will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States. It will not benefit a single livestock producer or dairyman or poultryman in this Nation. These checks will be mailed to the farmers in Canada after the cost of the administration of this program is deducted, they will be mailed to the farmers who produce this grain, on the basis of the number of bushels sold. It is an equalization fee that works like an allotment payment to farmers in foreign countries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the amount of money to which the gentleman just referred as cost to the Government function in practically the same category as a subsidy?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to the Canadian farmers. That is just what it would be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be a subsidy insofar as it applied to the Treasury of the United States of America.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to the Canadian or any other farmer. It would not help our farmers or our people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it would be a subsidy.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to those people in foreign countries. That is the reason I have opposed this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The exemptions from duties provided for by this joint resolution shall be subject to compliance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 55, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—255

Abernethy	Gregory	Merritt
Allen, La.	Griffiths	Morrow
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Michener
Anderson,	Gwynne	Miller, Conn.
N. Mex.	Hale	Miller, Mo.
Andresen,	Hall	Miller, Pa.
August H.	Edwin Arthur	Monroney
Angell	Halleck	Mott
Auchincloss	Hancock	Mruk
Barden	Hare	Mundt
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Murphy
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Harris, Ark.	Murray, Wis.
Beckworth	Harris, Va.	Myers
Bender	Hart	Newsome
Bennett, Mo.	Hartley	Norman
Blackney	Hays	Norrell
Bloom	Hébert	Norton
Bolton	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bonner	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Herter	O'Hara
Brooks	Hess	O'Konski
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Outland
Brumbaugh	Hobbs	Patton
Bryson	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Peterson, Ga.
Burch, Va.	Hollifield	Pfeifer
Burgin	Holmes, Mass.	Philbin
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Camp	Hull	Ploeser
Capozzoli	Izac	Plumley
Carter	Jeffrey	Poage
Case	Jenkins	Poulson
Chapman	Johnson,	Powers
Clark	Anton J.	Price
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
Coffee	Johnson,	Rabaut
Cole, N. Y.	Luther A.	Ramey
Colmer	Johnson,	Ramspeck
Cooper	Lyndon B.	Randolph
Costello	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Courtney	Johnson, Ward	Reece, Tenn.
Cox	Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.
Cravens	Kean	Richards
Crosser	Keefe	Rivers
Davis	Kennedy	Robertson
Delaney	Keogh	Rodgers, Pa.
Dilweg	Kerr	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Kinzer	Rolph
Disney	Klein	Rowan
Domenegeaux	Kunkel	Rowe
Dondoro	Landis	Russell
Doughton	Lanham	Sadowski
Drewry	Larcade	Sauthoff
Durham	LeCompte	Scanlon
Elliott	LeFevre	Schuetz
Ellison, Md.	Lesinski	Sheppard
Engle, Calif.	Lewis, Ohio	Sheridan
Fay	Luce	Short
Feighan	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Fellows	Lynch	Smith, Maine
Fenton	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Fernandez	McGehee	Smith, Wis.
Fisher	McGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Forand	McKenzie	Spence
Furlong	McLean	Springer
Gale	McMillan	Stanley
Gamble	McMurray	Starnes, Ala.
Gathings	McWilliams	Stearns, N. H.
Gavagan	Maas	Stewart
Gavin	Madden	Sullivan
Goodwin	Magnuson	Sundstrom
Gordon	Mahon	Talbot
Gorski	Maloney	Talle
Gossett	Manasco	Tarver
Graham	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Grant, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Tibbott
Grant, Ind.	May	Tolan

Towe
Treadway
Troutman
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorris, Ohio
Walter
Ward
Wasielewski

Weaver
Welchel, Ohio
Weiss
Welch
West
White
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth

Willey
Wilson
Winstead
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NAYS—55

Allen, Ill.
Arends
Arnold
Barrett
Bishop
Bradley, Mich.
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buffett
Burdick
Busbey
Carlson, Kans.
Carson, Ohio
Chenoweth
Chipperfield
Church
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Crawford

Cunningham
Curtis
Day
Dewey
Dworshak
Ellis
Ellsworth
Gilchrist
Granger
Hagen
Heidinger
Hoeven
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jensen
Johnson, Calvin D.
LaFollette

Lemke
Mansfield,
Mont.
Mason
Miller, Nebr.
O'Connor
Phillips
Praecht
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Rockwell
Rohrbough
Schiffner
Scribner
Simpson, Ill.
Stefan
Sumner, Ill.
Wheat
Winter

NOT VOTING—119

Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Baldwin, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barry
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Boren
Boykin
Buckley
Burchill, N. Y.
Byrne
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Celler
Clason
Compton
Cooley
Cullen
Curley
D'Alesandro
Dawson
Dickstein
Dies
Dirksen
Douglas
Eaton
Eberharter
Elmer
Elston, Ohio
Engel, Mich.
Fish
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Ford
Fulbright

Fuller
Fulmer
Gallagher
Gearhart
Gerlach
Gibson
Gifford
Gillette
Gillie
Gore
Green
Hall
Leonard W.
Hill
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson,
J. Leroy
Jones
Judd
Kearney
Kee
Kefauver
Kelley
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kieberg
Knutson
Lambertson
Lane
Lea
Lewis, Colo.
McCord
McCowan
Mansfield, Tex.
Martin, Iowa
Mills
Monkiewicz

Morrison, La.
Morrison, N. C.
Murdock
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Leary
O'Neal
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Reed, Ill.
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Calif.
Sabath
Sasser
Satterfield
Schwabe
Scott
Shafer
Sikes
Slaughter
Smith, Ohio
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Sparkman
Stevenson
Stockman
Sumners, Tex.
Taber
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Vincent, Ky.
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wene
Welchel, Ga.
Whitten
Wolcott
Woodrum, Va.

So the House joint resolution was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Vursell, against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Jones.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Schwabe.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Sasser with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Monkiewicz.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. McCowan.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Welchel of Georgia with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. J. LeRoy Johnson.
Mr. King with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Kieberg with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote yea.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman qualify?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to print in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks by including a statement of an opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States with reference to the Elk Hills contract, notwithstanding the fact that it is three and four-fifths pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of \$171.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding that and without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business and all special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Honorable Perry Belmont, former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement on the F. E. P. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three instances and to include therein in each instance an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on this resolution today may be given the opportunity of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial by Raymond Clapper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, in the extension of my remarks made during the debate today, certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Gallup poll recently taken.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the record and include therein a copy of a letter which has been addressed to members of the School Bus Drivers Association of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. HAYS were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem entitled "A Friend."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PEOPLE ARE ON TO IT

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, experience is the greatest of all teachers. Lessons learned by experience usually make a deep impression and furnish true guideposts for future conduct. Most intelligent people know enough to learn from experience. It is apparent that many in Government agencies and bureaus, functioning over the past 10 or 12 years, have not manifested enough intelligence to benefit from the experiences had with the American people. I think it can be safely said, without fear of successful contradiction, that independence and freedom form a part of and manifest themselves in American character and that these traits are possessed by every red-blooded American.

The American people are becoming mad—fighting mad, and thoroughly disgusted at the manner in which they have been treated during the past few years by the self-appointed guardians of human liberty and conduct, who are endeavoring to control every thought, word, and action of every American citizen. It might be well, here and now, to serve notice upon the planners and bureaucrats who have designed totalitarian regimentation as the garment to be fitted to every American citizen, that it just will not work. The people of this country do not want it and will not have it.

The efforts to bypass the Constitution of the United States and the laws made in pursuance thereof, as well as the economic system prevailing in this country, is apparent to every intelligent American. They are on to it and are not being fooled. The clever methods used in propaganda and processes of infiltration are also known to the average American citizen. It does not suit them, and they do not propose to have it. The American citizen loves and worships God, has a deep and abiding patriotism, and is devoted to country, Constitution, and flag. For the defense of these he is willing to give all. In return, he expects these things to provide him with what they guarantee him; that is, freedom to worship according to the dictates of conscience; freedom to assemble and discuss problems of mutual interest; freedom of speech, the press, and radio; freedom to work and to progress to a better life; and freedom from want and insecurity. To secure these benefits he is willing, if necessary to pay the supreme sacrifice. This is overwhelmingly demonstrated by the courageous conduct of our beloved ones in the armed forces, whose acts of bravery and sacrifice are unequalled in all history. The efforts of the planners to regiment and strait-jacket him in his life have utterly failed. They may just

as well quit. The day of boondoggling and subtle maneuvering is at an end. Men and women in Government places, either high or low, have got to give something back to the American people in the nature of substantial and constructive services, else they are going to be turned out, and mighty soon.

History over the past 10 or 12 years discloses an immense amount of boondoggling, bungling, inefficiency, and waste. This is now apparent to all Americans. First came the N. R. A., with laudable objectives, and which undoubtedly could have accomplished much if the human element had been recognized and cooperative constructive efforts used instead of attempting to coerce and drive Americans. Its purpose was to spread employment and business at a time when such was direly needed in this Nation.

The public-works program in which boondoggling and politics were of paramount importance, rather than honest employment of free American men and women to do a good job with a decent living wage. Also came the farm-control program in which the American farmers were regimented and were compelled to plow under the crops, slaughter their pigs, and engage in like destructive and unnatural practices of so vitally needed food, while the masses in the cities were in dire need of such food. I might also enumerate other agencies of Government under the sponsorship of the New Deal that sought to mix the elimination of misery and want with power and politics, and which, in every instance, miserably failed. All of this forms a part of the history of our Nation over the past dozen years.

Two years ago we became engaged in a gigantic conflict of arms—a global war. This is something in which all of our resources were and are required to produce victory. Did the boondoggling, politics, bungling, inefficiency, and waste stop? Positively no. It seemed only to encourage the planners to take advantage of this catastrophe and to grab control of all the sources of power over the economic structure in our Nation to further prosecute their designs for totalitarian regimentation. I do not mean to say that every person employed by the Government is guilty of these offenses. Many of them are not guilty. Even many of them occupying high places are not guilty, but either due to inadvertence, negligence, or failure to keep their eyes open to their surroundings, they became a part of this movement. It is now time for an awakening by those within the structure of our Government, else they also shall be judged guilty and with promptness turned out of office.

The Office of War Information was set up to give prompt and factual statements to the public of the part that we are performing in this war. They were also permitted to carry on, so far as is consistent with the purposes of this war, propaganda in enemy territory. This was a necessary and proper function. A voluntary censorship was set up with which the American press fully and wholeheartedly cooperated, and which, to the best of my knowledge, has sacredly

observed the rules laid down. However, the Office of War Information became infiltrated with many of those unsympathetic to our constitutional form of government and our economic system, and deliberately utilized their high office to assimilate propaganda in pursuance of their individual political philosophies. In fact, it seemed they were more interested in accomplishing this than in giving to the American people full and complete news regarding our progress and action in this war in which every American has a deep and continuing interest. It was a year after Pearl Harbor before we knew the nature of this catastrophe. Time after time important and material information has been withheld from the American people. Are we infants? Are we to be trusted, or are we incapable of self-government? Recently we have had another demonstration of the inaptness of this agency—the General Patton incident. The Cairo and Teheran conferences stories were given to us from outside sources. Much of our daily news comes to us from foreign capitals. The American people can take it whether it is good or bad. They need not be treated as imbeciles or morons.

The Office of Price Administration was created for the express purpose of creating ceiling prices preventing inflation and of providing for the uniform distribution of available food and other commodities for civilian use. Unfortunately for the country, it failed to carry out its original purposes in a careful and efficient manner, and as a result has had heaped upon it much criticism and the severest condemnation. When Mr. Chester Bowles assumed the role of Administrator he publicly proclaimed that from that time forward the Office of Price Administration would be vitally interested in the problem of fair rationing at rigid prices and would abandon its practices in an attempt to control profits of American industry and business. Of course this statement was only in confirmation of factual evidence secured by the select committee of the House of Representatives which had discovered that a design or plan was in operation in the Office of Price Administration whereby the primary purpose of that office was to regulate and control profits rather than to see that ceiling prices were established and rigidly maintained for the protection of the consumer and providing for the uniform distribution of available civilian goods. Now it has come to pass that in this program the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration in attempting to apply policies strange in form to our land of pioneers and freemen, the warehouses, freezing plants, and even docks are filled to capacity with foods, and that very shortly they are going to have to disgorge. Just how much they have nobody seems to know. Just what will be done with it they seem to know less about. Millions of pounds of butter, milk, eggs, fruit, vegetables, and other commodities, are threatened with immediate spoilage and will spoil unless immediately released for early use by the American consumer.

The farmer does not know what to do with his livestock today. He can neither feed it nor sell it. He has not been able to buy the feed to keep it and the packing houses have not been in any position to handle it because their refrigerators are filled to capacity. Likewise, the refrigerators of the distributors are filled to capacity and the poor supplicating public does not have the point values to buy this surplus of meat. Much of this is threatened with spoilage unless there is an immediate and drastic readjustment in the policy of the O. P. A. and the immediate reduction or abolition of point values on certain foods, so that the consumer can purchase and use such. The entire food situation is in very bad condition due to improper handling and unless there is an immediate drastic readjustment with the release for consumer purchases of a vast quantity of now stored food, the country is in for a terrific explosion that will rock the very foundation of bureaucracy and certainly will be followed by a sweeping house cleaning of inepts and of inefficients.

I would like to give you some idea of the feeling and temper of the people at this time, and I do not refer to the elections held last month over the country, and last week in the State of Kentucky, which I think very accurately reflect the thoughts of the people. On the contrary, I shall tell you of something that happened only last Saturday in a substantial and thriving Pennsylvania city and which is indicative of the feeling and temper of the American people, and which in itself should be sufficient warning to the policy makers or designers of a new economy, that the American people did not order any such thing, do not want it, and will not have it. Just let me read to you a press dispatch appearing in the Washington Star, Saturday, December 4, 1943:

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA., December 4.—An attempt of an O. P. A. agent to enforce ceiling prices on farm machinery at an auction sale on a farm near here resulted in 700 irate farmers forcing the agent to leave. Threatening to overturn his car if he did not leave, the farmers escorted the agent to his automobile. Then they returned to the business of buying farm equipment, some of which reportedly was sold at prices which the O. P. A. would brand as exorbitant.

The incident reflects the general feeling running throughout the length and breadth of the land today. It is the same sort of a feeling that ran throughout the length and breadth of the Thirteen Original Colonies immediately preceding the American Revolution and which precipitated the Boston Tea Party. I know the American people are too sensible and substantial to think of a revolution in which blood is shed. They are united such as they have never heretofore been united in support of our Government. The ballot supplies the means for the people to revolt in our country, and it is used intelligently and wisely whenever the people become dissatisfied, and while they are united as never before and intent upon the winning of the war at any cost they are likewise becoming equally as well united in their effort to secure an economical, efficient, and businesslike administration of the affairs of government. Let those who try to reform the American people in their thought and methods take heed. The spirit of independ-

ence and the prevailing determination to preserve liberty and constitutional government burns as hot in the breast of the American today as it did in '76. They don't want a managed economy. They don't want totalitarian regimentation, and they are not going to have it. The people are on to what is going on in the Government bureaus and agencies and they are against it. The American is not always fooled. The ballot is the means to a free, prosperous, secure, and progressive America, and the American people are intelligent enough to know how and when to most effectively use it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a communication from the Public Buildings Commission of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now over 5½ months since H. R. 2837, the so-called Fulmer bill, for the appointment of a single food administrator and other purposes, was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture. It has the unanimous support of the committee consisting of 14 Democrats and 12 Republicans. Nevertheless, most of this time the bill has lain dormant in the Rules Committee which, for reasons that are becoming more and more obvious, has refused to grant a rule and let the bill come on for hearings before the House. Time and again without avail Members in the Well of this House have pleaded that this bill, advocated by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, be heard, while other measures thoroughly unsound but purported to have the same objective, are engaging the attention of the Congress and the public.

One of these measures is consumer subsidies which has been repudiated by this House and is now before another body. It is becoming more and more obvious that this is in reality a fight between two philosophies of economy. The philosophy of a controlled economy, which is exemplified in consumers' subsidies, has barred consideration of the Fulmer bill as an agency of a free economic philosophy.

No sane American will deny that the aim of a successful war economy must be to stimulate and increase production and at the same time discourage and decrease consumption wherever possible. About the time of our entry into the war the President said that his administration would furnish the people with both guns and butter, but it was not long before he was compelled to admit that the American people would have to tighten their belts and accept a lower standard of living during the war. While it may be a question as to which philosophy he is working under at the present time, it is an inescapable fact that in an all-out

war such as we are engaged in, we cannot have both guns and butter in full measure; that we must make sacrifices; that we must accept a reduced standard of living, and that we must as a consequence endure inflation in a greater or lesser degree.

The only way to ameliorate this lowered standard of living caused by the demands of production for war and its diversion from normal channels is to increase production in those normal channels. This the Fulmer bill will accomplish, as has been stated time and time again. It is impossible for 10 or more agencies competing with each other for power, with their resultant indecisions, procrastinations, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding to bring our production of foodstuffs to its highest capacity.

It is equally impossible for such a conglomeration of agencies to effect economical distribution. We have heard numerous reports of administration hoarding and waste. Some time ago we learned that the War Food Administration was hoarding over 200,000,000 pounds of butter, or enough for a year's supply for our fighting forces. We were told it would stop buying until next April. The public may well wonder how much of this butter has spoiled. About the middle of November last, I was told that for a whole week the Food Distribution Administration was working overtime securing shipping on the Atlantic seaboard and securing labor and ice to pack cars with butter for shipment to Atlantic seaports to get the butter out of the United States. The question may well be asked how much of this butter had spoiled and was that the reason of their hysteria to get it out of the country. It has been stated by reliable sources that millions of eggs in administration warehouses have spoiled in storage, and the same has been reported of canned goods of various kinds. I have been reliably informed that upon inquiry for specific foods in stock piles, it sometimes took several weeks to locate them.

With so many agencies having their fingers in the pie, we cannot readily expect different results. On the other hand, a single food administrator with a competent organization clothed with power coequal to his responsibility would bring order out of this chaos and insure greater production with less waste, thereby ameliorating one of the chief causes of inflation.

However, instead of thus encouraging and cooperating with a free economy for the greatest possible production, the "palace guard" prefers to continue a condition of chaos, thereby not only promoting but insuring a continuation of their doctrine of scarcity, which constitutes a necessary basis for controlled economy. This in the face of the fact that as the United States has been the arsenal of democracy in the war, they propose that we shall also function as the granary of the world, especially in the early post-war period. Such an undertaking, in addition to supplying our own food, greatly emphasizes the fact that measures must be employed which

will insure the greatest possible production and at the same time discourage unnecessary consumption and waste.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's study, and I know the gentleman has made a very exhaustive study of lease-lend purchases, is it not a fact that as far as the gentleman knows—I will say it is as far as I know—that the New Deal has at no time done anything that has been decisively encouraging of production?

Mr. JONKMAN. They have done absolutely the contrary: discouraged production to create a state of scarcity upon which their doctrine of controlled economy must be based.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, the old doctrine of kill the little pigs is still prevalent among them.

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it not also true that we have had greater production of foodstuffs in the last 2 years than at any other time in the history of the country?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; but that was due to the fact that we had two of the finest seasons in succession that were ever known in the history of the country. We cannot bank upon that all the time. The Lord wants us to help ourselves as well.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the Almighty and I am very grateful for His bounty, but is it not true that when the production goes up the administration does not have anything to do about it, but when there is some impairment of production the administration is immediately blamed? I am suggesting that there might be an unfairness in our blaming the administration in the middle of an all-out war. While our economy has not worked perfectly, that it has worked as well as it has I think is a credit to this administration and not a discredit.

Mr. JONKMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that the farmers in the last 2 years have worked longer hours per day than ever before. They have had to work under exceptional hardships during the past two seasons when they were not given the machinery or the manpower they were entitled to. If we had a one-man administrator who would correlate this with the war effort I think we could expect much better results from our efforts.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to take all the gentleman's time, but I think the gentleman's position was not unreasonable and I was inclined to agree with him until a couple of months ago. When I thought a little further about it I felt that perhaps the control of all prices should be in one agency rather than the control of all food in one agency.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman was right up to 2 months ago.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is possible the gentleman was right, but I still think my position is correct.

Mr. JONKMAN. This, as I have said before, will be accomplished by the Fulmer bill, and the Fulmer bill therefore is the answer to inflation, which can be supplemented only by voluntary reduction of consumption and waste by the people themselves. It constitutes as nearly as possible in wartime the function of Government regulation and cooperation with a free economy.

However, the controlled-economy-minded administration will have none of this. Its controlled-economy addicts claim that the only measures adapted to the prevention of inflation are consumers' subsidies. Moreover, they boldly accuse their opponents of inconsistency if the latter have in the past voted for copper and similar producers' subsidies.

To drive home the error of this accusation, it is perhaps appropriate to again advert to the aim of a sound wartime economy, which, as we said before, must be to stimulate and increase production and at the same time discourage and decrease consumption wherever possible. In this connection there has not been sufficient emphasis on the difference between producers' subsidies and consumers' subsidies. Producers' subsidies stimulate and encourage production, while they have but little effect on consumption. Inasmuch as they increase the supply, they are therefore deflationary. On the other hand consumers' subsidies encourage and increase consumption and waste while they have no effect on production. Inasmuch as under them production is stationary and they tend to deplete the supply more rapidly, they are of course inflationary. The very fact that they are based upon the assumption that many people will not buy at existing prices or cannot buy at existing prices as the case may be, but will purchase at the reduced price—made up to the distributors or processors by the subsidy—demonstrates this fact. The resulting greater demand or scramble to consume which is the very basis of consumers' subsidies, in itself offsets any benefit to the consumer by this increased demand and consumption, and thereby the subsidy defeats itself and its purpose.

In other words, as far as inflation is concerned, producers' subsidies and consumers' subsidies are diametrically opposites; the first reducing inflation and the second increasing it under all circumstances. The fallacy of consumers' subsidies is further emphasized by claims such as were made by the majority leader in the debate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts spent nearly all of his time tracing the increase in recent years of excessive purchasing power. It seems to be his claim that the 35,000,000,000 estimated excess purchasing power in 1943 was the main cause of threatened runaway inflation and the reason for the proposed billion or so of consumers' subsidies. In other words, 35,000,000,000 of excessive purchasing power is inflationary and

threatens destructive inflation, but 35,000,000,000 is deflationary and will prevent further inflation. The fallacy of this reasoning is obvious.

Walter Lippmann, in his column last Saturday, admitted sled-length that consumers' subsidies are inflationary. But he seeks to argue that this inflationary force or influence can become anti-inflationary only because we are in the abnormal situation where the Government itself is a principal consumer.

He says:

If we were not in this abnormal situation, then obviously a Government subsidy to hold prices would be inflationary in that it increased the popular purchasing power by the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Did the gentleman happen to see the column of Walter Lippmann which I inserted in the Record a few days ago? It was his column for November 30. I have been interested in the gentleman's point of view. In that column Walter Lippmann pointed out what he contended, and I think correctly, was an inconsistency in the action of a majority of the House when it voted to forbid subsidies, on the one hand, on the ground there was plenty of purchasing power in the country, and on the very next day passed a most inadequate tax bill. In other words, his contention was that the House must have been wrong one day or the other. If there was an abundance of purchasing power available, then we should have passed a tax bill commensurate with that fact in order to come closer to paying for the war as we go along. If there were not that purchasing power, we should have been concerned with the fact that if prices rose a good many people would be in trouble.

Mr. JONKMAN. I shall show the errors of his reasoning in a moment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman think Walter Lippmann was wrong in his contention?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman thinks the House was consistent on those 2 days?

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

He continues:

The critics would then be quite right. But in our present situation the Government itself is not only a great consumer but it has an unlimited supply of purchasing power. Therefore, the more the Government has to pay for what it buys, the more inflationary money it will issue to get what it needs; the less it has to pay, because prices are kept down, the less inflationary money it has to put into circulation. For this special reason and in these special circumstances, subsidies which prevent a general rise of prices are, if correctly administered, contrainflationary. The cost of the subsidies is more than washed out by the much greater saving which comes from the Government's not having to pay higher prices for goods and for labor.

It will immediately be noted that there are a couple of if's and contingencies in the premise from which Mr. Lippmann

draws his conclusion of contrainflation. For he says:

Subsidies which prevent a general rise of prices—if correctly administered—are contrainflationary.

What kind of subsidies does he mean when he speaks of "subsidies which prevent a general rise in prices?" Certainly not a consumers' subsidy, for he has already said that "it would be inflationary in that it increased the popular purchasing power by the amount of the subsidy." That is therefore not in itself a subsidy which will prevent a general rise in prices. He is begging the whole question. Moreover he states that these unknown, unidentified subsidies must be correctly administered to affect contrainflation. It is inconceivable that an administration addicted to a controlled economy based upon a spend-and-spend program, could even begin to correctly administer such a spree.

It is axiomatic of course that any sound measure—whether subsidy or what have you—which would prevent a further or general rise in prices would be contrainflationary. It is also true that if consumers' subsidies, whether they are sound or unsound, would be accepted as a permanent substitute for wage increases by all of the elements demanding wage increases, they would probably solve that problem. But they will not be so accepted.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gist of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] which very nearly carried the House, tried to tie prices to wages. The amendment would have allowed the use of subsidies only as long as there was not a general increase in wages. Does not the gentleman think that is a sound approach?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; I think it is a snare and a delusion. Either consumer subsidies are sound or they are unsound. You cannot say 10 percent is sound but 100 percent is unsound.

Once it becomes clear by experience that consumers' subsidies are in themselves inflationary; that they do not make food cheaper or more easily obtainable; that they are merely a snare and a delusion thrown out to temporarily avoid demands for increased wages, the increased wage problem will have to be faced anyway. In fact, their use so far has already demonstrated their failure to stop wage increases or reduce the cost of living.

In the meantime we will have saddled on the people a more stupendous bureaucracy and dictatorship than even this bureaucracy-ridden generation ever witnessed. For this bureaucracy will not stop at spending a billion a year. To realize this it is well to look back just a few months in the history of consumers' subsidies.

In the early part of this year the President contemplated and began the use of public funds for consumers' sub-

sidies. It was claimed by many people and Members of Congress that this was a usurpation of powers not vested in him. It will be remembered that in July of this year both Houses of Congress passed a Commodity Credit Corporation bill containing a prohibition against the use of public moneys for such subsidies.

Again it will be recalled that this bill was vetoed by the President which was his constitutional prerogative. This made the use of the taxpayers' money for consumers' subsidies the law of the land under constitutional processes unless and until Congress changed it by overriding the veto. We all know that the House failed to muster the two-thirds vote to override the veto and then passed a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without the prohibition against consumers' subsidies. Clearly this did not leave the matter of consumers' subsidies hanging in mid-air. While it in all probability was a usurpation of power before the attempted legislation, Congress by its failure to prohibit use of public money for such subsidies by a two-thirds vote, which it could have done, made it the law of the land and gave the President another blank check.

Flushed with this victory and the blank check, were the bureaucrats content to continue their experiments with subsidies of a few cents on butter, beef, and coffee? Indeed not. If I remember correctly this legislation was before the Congress the day before we adjourned for the recess last summer. I had hardly gotten back to my district when I read in the newspapers that under the confirmed powers, the administration was planning machinery to buy up all the basic foodstuffs direct from the producers and distribute them to the consumers either through Government or private distribution centers; that they would be sold at whatever price the administration saw fit, and the loss would be made up by subsidies. It was even stated that Congress would not oppose the scheme.

It is true that since that time there has not been much further public disclosure of this plan or machinery. Forceful public and congressional reaction has probably made the bureaucrats cautious. But that is the result to which consumers' subsidies must inevitably lead. Such a feeding of the entire population as public charges by the administration with printing press money is the objective of the apostles of a controlled economy.

However, it is fortunate that the palace guard disclosed and overplayed its hand. It has served to put the American people on guard. The people know that in Europe wherever it has been tried, beginning with the Roman Empire, there is not a single instance in which subsidies in the long run were used successfully in stemming the tide of inflation. On the contrary, they always caused inflationary chaos and disaster.

It is encouraging to find that the Members of the House are awakening to the danger. In the first vote on June 25 last, the vote was 244 against and 108 for sub-

sidies. The vote to override on July 2 was 228 against and 154 for. In the last vote on November 23, the vote was 278 against and 117 for, or almost two-and-a-half to one against subsidies.

This is encouraging. Congress must not be intimidated by threats of blame for inflation or appeals antagonizing the so-called white collar workers. Most of these know that food subsidies would not as much as get them a mess of pottage, and that it is more dangerous than a mirage, notwithstanding the fact that they have been the greatest sufferers of "palace guard" maladministration.

Consumers subsidies must be defeated and inasmuch as proponents frantically ask what other remedy have you, our answer is sound measures based upon American principles of which H. R. 2837, the Fulmer bill, is one. Again I repeat, this bill should be brought on for hearing before the House. Its immediate passage and application to our economy would largely solve our problem.

THE LATE VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House that former Congressman Vincent F. Harrington, of Sioux City, Iowa, who formerly represented the Ninth District of Iowa, died of a heart attack in England. His death has just been confirmed by The Adjutant General of the Army. He was a major of the Army Air Transport in England at the time of his death.

He served in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses and resigned during his last term to enter the Army Air Corps. He served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives and will be missed by all who knew him.

I join a host of friends in paying respect to his memory and extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and children and to the other members of his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the news that has just been brought to us by our colleague from Iowa strikes very deeply in my own mind and heart. Vincent Harrington was one of my very best friends and he was one of the most conscientious, earnest Members of Congress I ever served with. He was an all-American football star at Notre Dame. He came here from a district in northwestern Iowa where he always had a tough fight to be elected. He was able to be elected in that district largely because of his sterling personal qualities. When the war came along, he offered his services as he had done previously. His loss is going to be felt throughout the length and breadth of

this country by the people of his district, by his colleagues in the House, and by our armed forces in which he served with such distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I requested this time today before I knew that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] was going to follow me with a special order. It so happens I know what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is going to speak about and I want to devote a couple of minutes of my time to preface what his remarks are going to be.

We have heard recently, and very properly so—I have made one of them myself—appeals for immediate action to take care of the needs and to meet the contingencies of the men who are now and will in increasing numbers be discharged from the armed forces. Some of the statements that I have heard in the House about this matter have simply been appeals that Congress ought to do something about it. The speech of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], on the contrary, is going to be a specific outline of something we can do about it and he is going to outline for us a bill which he introduced today, I believe, that will meet, in my judgment, the first basic problem.

I confess that I have been working on a bill myself, which would have been a very simply measure, the whole purpose being to require that on the date of discharge every man be given a pamphlet describing to him precisely what his rights, entitlements, and benefits are under the laws regarding veterans. I am not introducing that bill and the reason I am not introducing it is because I am convinced that the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the Military Affairs Committee, has dealt with that problem more completely in his bill than my own simple proposal would have done. I want to express here and now my appreciation for the fine and earnest work the gentleman from Louisiana has done and will do on this matter.

I still believe that every man should be provided with such printed factual information so that he will know exactly what his entitlements are. I am informed that the gentleman from Louisiana will not only include that in his bill but that it will also include a basic provision for a 3 months' furlough before a man is finally discharged, during which time he will no longer be in active service but will still receive pay and allowances as a member of the armed service. This 3 months' period he may use in any way he sees fit toward making his adjustment back into civilian life. During this 3 months' period he will be entitled to receive full cooperation and benefit from the Veterans' Administration, from the Employment Services, and from every other governmental agency that can minister to his needs and will also have the advantage and assistance of all the veterans' organizations in assisting him in filing any claims that he may legitimately have.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that I do not mean to make his speech for him. However, I am deeply interested in this matter. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very happy to realize that the gentleman has devoted much time and attention to a subject that is so vital to this Congress at the present time and to the country generally. I think the gentleman's idea is very good. A bulletin containing a statement of the rights and benefits and preferences to which veterans are entitled when they are discharged ought to be in the hands of every man. In one hand he should have the discharge and in the other hand that bulletin.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

I have been concerned about this subject because I have known of a few instances where I believe men have been discharged with medical discharges and where they just have not known what their entitlements were. I think they should have known before they were discharged.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have been very much concerned lately—and perhaps the gentleman knows something about it—about these veterans who have received some sort of a mental or psychic shock. Quite frequently they were apparently all right before they got into the service, but I have heard of several cases where they had been in the service only a short time, and possibly the doctors were too zealous in trying to prove that their disability was not service-connected. I hesitate to criticize the armed services at any time, because I believe the war is being well handled, and I think our Army and Navy are being well handled, but it strikes me that the doctors should lean over backward to try to find service connection in the case of mental shocks that have arisen in this war. I am told that mental injuries comprise a large portion of the injuries that are received by our soldiers. May I have the gentleman's comment on that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My comment is that the record shows that as to the veterans of the First World War the increase of disability is more in the field of nervous and neuropsychiatric difficulties than in any other type of disability, and that as to this war the nervous strain is probably greater than ever before. I would feel that very special attention ought to be given by the best people in the whole world to a program whereby those men can be given an opportunity for real rehabilitation. I think that instead of being too careful to try to prove that this disability is not service-connected the Nation has a fundamental responsibility to those men.

I may say that I have myself introduced a bill to define permanent and total disability in terms of industrial inadaptability, whereby the attempt was made to define industrial inadaptability

so that a man might be rated totally and permanently disabled if he did have a difficulty of the sort the gentleman refers to so it prevents him from carrying on a gainful occupation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman feels that way. I have known of two or three specific cases of that character. I think it is false economy to fail to do everything we can for a soldier who is trying to adapt himself, when it was the service of his country that at least provided the background and the changed conditions that might have induced him to slip over the line, even though he might have had a predisposition toward such a condition before he got into the service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time primarily in order to talk about a group of Government officials. I wanted to talk about some people who I suppose may by some stretch of the imagination be called bureaucrats. I wanted to talk about them because I think they have rendered one of the most fundamental and outstanding services to democratic life in the United States that has been rendered by anybody in the last 50 years.

TEN-YEAR HISTORY OF THE ANTITRUST DIVISION

More than half a century ago the people of this country and their Congress recognized the inherent danger of too much concentration of economic power. They saw that the instrument for this power was the creation of industrial monopolies and various types of monopolistic controls. The long congressional debates leading to the passage of the Sherman antitrust laws pictured those evils as they existed 50 years ago. It would be surprisingly appropriate to give those same speeches today with the change of only a few names. The monopoly problem has not been solved.

This failure to deal with and conquer a traditional evil is no fault of the law itself. The act is perfectly clear as to what it intends to prohibit, and the type of free competitive system it means to perpetuate.

The trouble always has been that the law was not enforced.

The monopolistic groups themselves have often been in the forefront giving lip service to the principle of competitive enterprise. And they were perfectly sincere in those pronouncements. They strongly believe in competition—for everybody but themselves. They could well afford to demand that the antitrust laws be enforced when their friends and even their protégés had control of the enforcement machinery. It is only in the last 10 years that they have really felt the bite of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In the last 10 years there has been a serious and sustained effort toward enforcement.

But 10 years is not even a beginning. No appreciable percent of the existing monopolies could be broken up in 10 years—and even if all of them were broken up, and the Government then relaxed its enforcement efforts, they could be re-formed again before the ink was dry on the Court's judgment.

The preservation of a free competitive system is a continuing battle. It is like larceny. We could catch all the burglars today and lock them up securely in jail, but if the vigilance of police authorities were not maintained there would be a new outbreak of robbery tomorrow.

The record of enforcement of antitrust laws during the past 10 years is worthy of note. It is a record in which we might well take pride, but not the sort of pride which involves a relaxation.

Let me review these accomplishments during the past decade.

From 1933 to 1943 the Antitrust Division had four Assistant Attorneys General: Harold Stephens from 1933 to 1935; John Dickinson from 1935 to 1937; Robert H. Jackson from 1937 to 1938; and Thurman Arnold from 1938 to 1943.

During this 10 years the Antitrust Division passed through three distinct stages: First, organization; second, investigation; and third, enforcement. Consider the accomplishment: The Division instituted 342 cases during the 10-year period prior to 1933 and 3,512 during the period after; it collected barely more than \$1,000,000 in fines before, and twelve and one-half millions after; it indicted 3,711 new defendants before, and 11,255 after; and it terminated 274 cases prior to 1933 and 3,106 in the decade following.

But these figures are only partially indicative. The effort is also measured in terms of, first increased public support, and second the expansion of the frontiers of antitrust decisions.

In 1933 the Antitrust Division had an appropriation of \$125,000; a total personnel of 67 clerks, stenographers, and lawyers; was working on 8 antitrust cases; and was negotiating two consent decrees. With approximately 25 lawyers available for antitrust work, it could not press more than five major cases at one time, and then no staff was available for developing new cases. Violations of the Sherman Act were so much an accepted procedure in American business practice that there was a general assumption to the effect that the antitrust laws were mere symbols of a good but impractical economic theory. This, in spite of the fact the courts had held with uninterrupted consistency that the Sherman Act actually meant "every contract, combination, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade" was illegal.

The sole trouble was lack of enforcement. At any time during the past 20 years 5,000 potential antitrust cases could have been started with the availability of an adequate staff. But when, as in 1933, only 8 cases were brought, it is apparent that a violator of the antitrust laws stood about one chance in 600 of being prosecuted.

Such a gamble would have been tempting even if the rewards had been small. But when it is considered that price fixing and other restraints may well add millions to the coffers of the successful offender, and that he stood a 600-to-1 chance against getting caught, it was a temptation beyond the power of profit-mad business to resist.

In addition to those willful and knowing violators, there were hundreds of honest business folk who violated the Sherman Act through sheer ignorance of its provisions, leaving behind clearly convincing records and documents in their files.

In 1933 the antitrust laws had been on the books for 40 years. Could they be enforced? Would serious enforcement reveal weaknesses sufficient to warrant their repeal? Were they, after all, good or bad laws?

There was only one way to answer those questions—and that was by launching a deadly serious and efficient enforcement program. The acid test of application was the only way.

But an antitrust enforcement program cannot be started over night. It requires anywhere from 6 months to 2 years to investigate and prepare a large antitrust case, and from a month to 8 months to try it. Slow and careful preparations had to be made. A staff must be recruited, trained, or organized for this specialized work. Complaints had to be studied and selections made between them. Investigations had to be made and grand jury proceedings conducted. All of this took time and all of it was necessary before a single case could be brought.

Congress increased the appropriation from \$125,000 in 1933 to \$314,000 in 1934. The beginning had been made. Never in all its 40 years of history had the appropriation for antitrust enforcement approached that figure. With that start, sponsored by Assistant Attorney General Stephens, the Division began assembling and training a competent staff. Nearly 20 additional lawyers were brought in. From that time forth the professional standard of the Antitrust Division has been outstanding. During the past 10 years 3 members of its staff have graduated into Assistant Attorneys Generalship, more than a dozen into lucrative practices, several into general counselship of big corporations, 3 into Congress, and, but for war which has claimed more than 100, this trend would be even more impressive.

The first year of the vitalized Antitrust Division was devoted to building up and training a staff. The number of cases terminated actually dropped from eight to four. Not a penny was collected in fines. On the surface it looked as if an increase in appropriation was followed by a recession in enforcement activity. But an understanding Appropriations Committee appreciated the time necessary for getting started and, the next year, raised the appropriation by \$100,000.

This moderate but constant growth permitted the Division to expand and train for the colossal job ahead. Over the past 10 years the appropriation increased an average of approximately \$200,000 each year until it exceeds \$2,000,000. Congress has always shown great interest in the enforcement of the antitrust laws and has given the Division all it has asked. The wisdom of that attitude has been proved not only in the enforcement program itself, but

in the additional fact that the Division has already turned back to the Treasury in fines considerably more money than it has spent in enforcement. It is conclusive proof that a vitalized antitrust-enforcement program not only pays for itself but constitutes a definite profit to the Government. But of greatest importance is the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the consuming public by the removal of illegal restraints. It has been estimated that this saving is measured in terms of billions of dollars.

In these first years of the new antitrust program there was a temporary setback during N. R. A. days. After that the development of an antitrust enforcement program went steadily ahead under Assistant Attorneys General Dickinson and Jackson until 1938. During those 3 years the number of Sherman Act cases—distinguished from kindred law cases—instituted each year rose from 4 to 13. The result of having an enlarged staff on investigation and preparation was beginning to make itself felt.

Then, in March of 1938, Thurman Arnold was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Division. He inherited an able and trained staff built up by his predecessors, but he brought with him something new—a driving zeal for wholesale antitrust enforcement which made him one of the most beloved and at the same time one of the most hated and feared men in public life.

The number of new Sherman Act cases jumped from 13 in 1938 to 92 in 1939. The number of kindred law cases jumped from 206 to 345. The appropriation went from \$780,000 to \$1,309,000, and the total amount of fines collected went from \$85,000 to \$2,693,000. And of the 33 cases terminated that year, the Division had the amazing record of winning 31 and losing only 2.

After 5 years of sound and gradual building, the staff and the leader had met for the inauguration of the first serious effort to enforce the antitrust laws in nearly half a century.

During the next 5 years the Division instituted 44 percent of all the antitrust proceedings instituted during its whole existence of 53 years. Arnold stated his point of view during his first year in office—speech, Herald Tribune Forum, New York, October 26, 1938.

Describing government as the art of compromise, he said:

It consists in reconciling organizations which give people goods and services with the organizations expressing the spiritual values which give them unity and morale. Every organized state must have its established church, or, as I have expressed it elsewhere, its folklore. That church must embody the fundamental truths and principles which give the states its greatness. At the same time that church must not impose ridiculous and unnecessary material sacrifices on the great mass of the people. . . . When the organizations representing the ideals of a culture, whether they be economic, legal, or moral (and the three always merge together), so interfere with the practical distribution of material comforts that it becomes obvious this sacrifice is unnecessary, a spiritual or psychological conflict develops. . . . Practical necessities for the mo-

ment are lost in the paralyzing effect of reiterated phobias. The neurosis continues until practical organizations again distribute the goods which people need. If this end is not achieved, if nobody succeeds in making the practical organizations function, the church itself falls. * * *

Nevertheless, as a practical matter, we cannot escape talking as if nations had morals and group free will. Only in this way are people stirred to action. * * * I would be the last to attack that uniform of principle which gives to simple ordinary persons like myself, and my colleagues at Washington, and to the leaders of business with whom I come into both friendly and unfriendly contact, our prestige and power. * * * We must first make obeisance to the ideals, the mystery, the romance, and magic which give our social organizations the flavor and character which we revere and then emerge from the church to the backyard where wood needs to be sawed.

What is the woodpile that the practical man in Government is facing today? There are many names for it, but I prefer the phrase "unused capacity." * * * How are we going to saw that woodpile? To run our prospective plant at capacity, prices must be adjusted to income. * * * My hope is that the adjustment between prices and income may be made within the limits of our competitive ideal of free and independent producers, buyers, and sellers. Compromises are necessary in cases where modern industrial techniques require such vast organizations that they are in fact small governments within the Government, but no more of such compromises should be made than the hard, cold facts require.

Accompanying this new philosophy of antitrust enforcement went a new technique. For the first time in its history the Division departed from a policy of mere cases and adopted a plan designed to clear at one time an entire industrial segment from restrictive restraints.

The first of these programs was an attack against the use of patents as a means of evading the antitrust laws. Arnold attacked with all weapons at hand. He made speeches, appeared before committees of Congress, sponsored a patent investigation before the Temporary National Economic Committee, and proceeded with antitrust investigations, grand jury indictments, and suits. There was launched a series of prosecutions intended to prevent the pooling of patents for restrictive purposes. These involved such industries as glass bottle manufacturers, makers of spectacles, rock wool, plasterboard, computing gasoline pumps, and numerous others.

They led into another and equally vital field of control by means of private international agreements in which the world was divided into noncompeting territories. Among the articles involved here were military optical instruments, synthetic rubber, magnesium, pharmaceutical products, dyestuffs, lighting equipment, chemicals, petroleum, and nonferrous metals. Thus the new and serious cartel situation was first exposed to the American public.

The second Nation-wide program was a comprehensive investigation of the entire housing and building industry. Evidence had been developed which indicated that nearly 40 percent of the cost of a house went to the payment of var-

ious types of levies exacted by restrictive practices. It was recognized that one case involving one restraint might get some good law but not solve the major objective—the reduction of the cost of building a house. Therefore, after due preparation, 11 grand juries were called throughout the country. Approximately 100 lawyers, or half of the entire antitrust staff, were assigned to investigate and present the evidence. Scores of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents were used to search files, locate documents, and interview witnesses. The result was a large-scale country-wide attack aimed at all factors in the industry. The direct effect of the drive could be measured in some specific instances, as in Pittsburgh where the building costs of a housing project were reduced 17 percent. There were many more intangible results which could not be measured in such exact terms. One was the freeing to a large extent of prefabricated housing which, it is hoped, will open a new era of low-cost housing after the war.

The building program was moving with conspicuous success until a Supreme Court decision established the immunity of labor from prosecution under the Sherman Act. Thereafter it was never possible to deal with all the factors which go to make up the high cost of building.

The third broad program dealt with the cost of food distribution. Again the attack was directed against all types of restraint entering the food-distribution picture, from the farmer to the consumer. Indictments were returned against dairy companies, bakers, cheese manufacturers, producers of fruits and vegetables, meat packers, wholesale establishments, and several chain stores. The specific objective was to reduce the spread between the original grower and the ultimate consumer. Much progress could be shown in this endeavor, but the declaration of war and the consequent necessity of price control and rationing brought an inevitable postponement to some of the activity. It is an important fact, however, that the Antitrust Division is prepared to renew its efforts in this direction once the war is over and normal business methods are resumed.

The fourth major program developed was designed to deal with the artificial costs in the transportation field. Here again the specific objective was to eliminate restrictive practices governing the rates for moving the Nation's goods and supplies. That program, the butt of one of the bitterest attacks ever marshaled against the forces of free competition, is still progressing although great pressure is being exerted to have it stopped. As the public understanding increases, the inevitability of its continuance becomes more apparent.

The fifth and last major program dealt with international cartels. This came as an outgrowth of other work such as patents and the investigation of the chemical and the petroleum industries. Some phases of this work were necessarily stopped because of the war, but there is wide agreement in all quarters that investigating efforts should be continued.

In addition to the 5 major programs referred to above, the Antitrust Division carried on a great number of miscellaneous investigations and suits where business complainants appealed to the Government for protection against the aggressive tactics of dominant concerns. Among these were the fire-insurance companies, the loan-shark racket, fertilizer producers, the big oil companies, the Aluminum Co. of America, the American Medical Association, and numerous others. In conformity with a mandate of Congress the continuance of the nonwar work of the Antitrust Division is reflected in the fact that new antitrust cases instituted during the first war year were only 39 less than the peak year just prior to the war.

As an indication of the congressional attitude toward antitrust work the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives incorporated into its report for the first war year the following view: "The committee feels that even though the war and all matters connected with it is our prime objective at the moment the nonwar work of the Antitrust Division should not be relaxed, not only because of its indirect connection with the war effort, but also because of the need for protecting our post-war economy."

During the past 10 years the Division has pioneered on the legal frontiers as well as in enforcement technique. A brief history of this trend in legal doctrine may be helpful.

Two major departures were made during this period in enforcement techniques. One related to approach and the other to the type of case.

Prior to 1938 the few cases brought were concerned largely with developing occasional new points of law. Court tests were made to determine whether a particular practice of a single business concerned violated the Sherman Act. Such isolated and fragmentary enforcement made no fundamental change in our economic structure or in methods of doing business. Antitrust cases were of interest largely to lawyers as a legal game. The impact of a decision favorable to the Government was scarcely felt by the public. Even the business of the defendant company was affected but little, since a new device for achieving the same result could be instituted quickly to replace the activity condemned.

Then the Division started using the antitrust laws for a frontal and vertical effort to bring about healthy conditions in an entire industry. Every restraint in an industry from producer through processor, jobber, carrier, and retailer was attacked simultaneously. With all such restraints removed the collective result was of sufficient magnitude to be felt. The two best illustrations of this type of approach were the Nation-wide campaigns in the housing and food industries mentioned earlier. For the first time in 50 years the general public was made aware of the benefits of free competition through enforcement of the antitrust laws. With all restraints removed from

an industry, the home owner or consumer could realize in dollars and cents the effect of competitive forces.

The second departure concerned type of case. Prior to 1938 the general policy was to bring most antitrust cases on the civil side of the docket. As a result few cases were litigated. Consent judgments were entered. Violations of such decrees went largely unpunished. Then came the policy of enforcing the antitrust laws through criminal indictments. The shock of indictment, quite apart from the criminal penalties attached, was a real deterrent to continued violations. As part of this policy it was announced that the Department would dismiss a pending criminal suit if the defendants voluntarily offered, in addition to an agreement to cease the violations charged, "substantial public benefits connected with the policy of maintaining free competition in an orderly market which could not be obtained by the criminal prosecutions." This settlement policy was abandoned in 1940 because of the repeated charge that the Department was using the threat of criminal proceedings to force its economic ideas on industry. Since 1940, criminal cases have been brought in most instances, but can only be settled by nolo contendere pleas and the imposition of fines, even where injunctive relief is sought and secured in addition.

Certain definite lines of advance in judicial thinking on antitrust problems are discernible, in at least four directions, from cases decided in the last 10 years. The frontiers of antitrust enforcement have been extended as to, first, the determination that price fixing is illegal per se; second, the determination that full-line forcing is a business practice in violation of the Sherman Act; third, the determination that an express agreement to fix prices is not necessary to establish illegality under the Sherman Act if the result is the same; and, fourth, a determination that certain professional services were regarded as trade commerce within the meaning of the Sherman Act.

These extensions of the scope of the act came about as follows:

First. Most lawyers believed that the illegality of price-fixing agreements under the Sherman antitrust law had been established in the Trenton Potteries case—*Trenton Potteries v. United States* (273 U. S. 392)—in 1927, holding that it was no defense if the prices agreed upon were reasonable. But it was generally considered that a price-fixing agreement, in order to be unlawful, should inflexibly prescribe exact prices.

However, in the Socony Vacuum case—*United States v. Socony Vacuum Oil Company* (310 U. S. 150)—it was established that a conspiracy by any means to raise or lower prices, even to the level of the fair-market value and regardless of reasonableness—the same, pages 219–221—is illegal under the Sherman Act, even though the prices were not fixed uniformly and inflexibly—the same, page 222.

Second. "Full line forcing," by which is meant a requirement by a seller that

the buyer purchase certain other commodities as a condition of purchasing those he desires, has long been thought to be illegal under the Sherman Act, but the precise question has never been conclusively decided—compare *United States v. United Shoe Machinery Co.* (247 U. S. 32) with *United Shoe Machinery Co. v. United States* (258 U. S. 451). However, in the General Motors case—*United States v. General Motors Corp.* (121 F. (2d) 376, cert. den. 314 U. S. 618)—the result reached is that full line forcing is illegal. There the defendants, manufacturers of automobiles, forced dealers to exclusively use a financing company owned by them, in extending credit to all who purchased automobiles on time. The Court held that the trade-in and financing of automobiles was illegally restrained by this practice, and, as a practical proposition, upheld the division's views regarding full line forcing.

Third. The idea that an express agreement between conspirators is essential to a conspiracy under the Sherman Act has persisted in many quarters from the beginning, but this view was expressly repudiated, and the view that a conspiracy may be implied from the circumstances was reinforced in the Masonite case—*United States v. Masonite Corporation* (316 U. S. 265)—where the court reiterated that circumstantial evidence may be relied upon by the Government, in antitrust cases, to establish a conspiracy. There, it was also held that a combination to fix prices results from adherence to prices promulgated by one member of a combination, acting independently, where all members knew of the plan and were bound by separate agreements to adhere thereto.

Fourth. It has never been decided that professional "services" were "trade or commerce," within the Sherman Act, but in the American Medical Association case—*American Medical Association v. United States* (317 U. S. 519)—which involved the construction of section 3 of the Sherman Act—prohibiting any person from restraining trade or commerce in the District of Columbia—the court decided that "any person" as used in the act includes all who engage in the prohibited activities, and that it is no excuse that they are engaged in an honorable profession. And, construing the remainder of the section, it held that a conspiracy among physicians to restrain or destroy the competition in and the free availability of medical and hospital services is illegal. Of course, the question whether restraints of competition upon the rendition of "services" is illegal under sections 1 and 2 of the act is still open, but it is probable the court will treat "services" as a part of the "trade and commerce" of the United States.

No history of the Antitrust Division covering the past 10 years can be completed without a review of the Division's effort in behalf of small business. The Sherman Act was primarily designed to preserve competition. Competition is predicated on the principle that there must be competitors.

The urgent necessity of swift war production brought about a situation where the Government began dealing almost exclusively with the big companies. Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post-War Planning, recently made the statement that more than 70 percent of all war contracts were centered in 100 large corporations. This condition inevitably threatened the very existence of countless small business establishments throughout the country. Numbers of them appealed to the Antitrust Division as the traditional protector of little competitors. The work of the Division in this respect has been conspicuously successful. Literally hundreds of small manufacturing plants have been kept in operation merely by the fact that the Antitrust Division was able to call their potential capacities to the attention of the contracting officers.

This work was carried on with no headlines. The results are intangible things which cannot be reflected in statistical tabulations, but the numerous letters from businesses which have been saved from ruin bring a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment to all who have participated in this work.

Events may well prove that the accomplishments of the Small Business Section of the Antitrust Division constituted the greatest single factor in the preservation of the competitive system in America.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this speech today not because it deals with a matter which is intimately connected with the war in which our country is now engaged. I want to sound this fundamental warning: The future of freedom, the future of democratic life, for which this war is being fought, depends fundamentally upon the peoples of the nations being stronger than and able to control every international cartel or monopoly which seeks to make itself supreme over the public welfare and even over nations.

After the last World War the German cartelized industry was ready the day the war concluded and the day that Germany acknowledged military defeat, to commence its work of gaining an industrial control through cartelization of many of the industries of the entire world, a control which stood it in good stead when this war came. It is well for us to be forewarned.

The Antitrust Division is an agency of government that, in my judgment, has rendered an outstanding service. I am glad to have my speech concerning that agency a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY AND BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Mr. BROOKS. I have heard the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis], who has just preceded me. During the last few days I have conferred with him on sev-

eral occasions about the matter of the handling of discharged servicemen and servicewomen as they go back into civilian life. I am glad at this time to have the opportunity of saying that wherever the interest of the average man or wherever the interest of the underprivileged is at stake, my friend and distinguished colleague from California is always found working and fighting, giving to those groups in society the privileges to which they ought to be, and to which they are, entitled under a real democratic system of government. It has been a real pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, over the last number of days there has been one speech after another on the floor of the House of Representatives having reference to the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen. There have been various criticisms of what has not been done and various suggestions as to what should be done in those cases. We all realize we are approaching a vastly important problem, a problem that will be with us over the next generation, perhaps as long as you and I live. We want to approach this problem in a different manner to that which the Congress of the United States approached it after the last war. We want to be able to give those men as they come out of the service a definite program of rights, benefits, and assistance to which they as veterans serving in a great war are entitled.

I might say this also—at the present time the Committee on Military Affairs of the House is engaged in hearings covering several bills which have for their purpose the paying of a mustering-out pay to veterans. I have a bill which goes a good deal further in our aid than merely paying mustering-out pay.

Mr. Speaker, on November 9 and 10, in Washington, D. C., the National Council of American Veterans' Organizations, composed of the national representatives of the service organizations of America, met and adopted plans for the post-war period. One of the recommendations of this meeting which I think is entitled to great weight is that a 3-month furlough before discharge be granted to all members of the armed forces of the United States.

Need has now become very apparent for the enactment of this recommendation into law at a very early date. During the course of the present year, almost a million members of the armed forces will be discharged and released back into civilian life. Many of them are men and women who are returned from foreign areas disabled and physically unfit to carry on with the war effort. Many are battle casualties whose cases cry loudly for immediate attention.

Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared with the able assistance of Mr. Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, and have introduced a joint resolution today which will give these men and women the help which Congress wants them to have at the termination of their armed service.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana who is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and who has worked long and diligently on matters of this character.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I want to commend my colleague for presenting this legislation. I think he has rendered to the country a distinct service and I know that his modesty prevents him from admitting that he is peculiarly qualified to speak and act on this question because the gentleman saw service in the First World War and was overseas for a long time and rendered distinguished service in that war. I want to say to my colleague that I am tremendously interested in this subject and I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will bring to the House legislation along this line even before the holidays. We ought to act and act soon.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my colleague from Louisiana for his very complimentary remarks. I want to assure him that the Committee on Military Affairs met this morning and will meet tomorrow morning on the subject of mustering-out pay; and the committee, I believe, feels the seriousness of urgent action on the matter.

This resolution provides for the granting of a 3-month furlough before discharge to men and women of the armed forces, which includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. It will permit members of these services to be released under furlough into civilian life with the knowledge that for 3 months they will receive the pay and allowances which they by law receive as members of the armed forces. During the furlough time, they may readjust themselves, renew their contacts in business life, apply for and receive gainful employment and in general make full arrangements for the return to normal civilian life.

In many cases the families of these men in service have moved away from their homes. In some cases they have consolidated their living quarters with those of near relatives. In other cases they have followed the servicemen from place to place throughout the course of their service as long as they are in the continental United States, and tried to remain with them during their service. As a result of this fact, the man or woman being discharged from the armed services of the Nation finds himself or herself in the position of going back home, and having to make all necessary arrangements for a home, make all arrangements to return to work and renew all of their contacts, literally starting all over again in life.

During the 3-month-furlough period, the obligation is placed upon the Government to assemble their service records, including medical records so that at the time of discharge they may immediately be available for use.

The facts indicate now that the medical records are not available in all cases. When a man comes to the point of being discharged, his medical records may be

scattered over several places at distant points and time is required to assemble these records. As a result of that fact, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for the Veterans' Administration, under the present arrangement in many cases, to make immediate adjudication of a worthy claim for disability benefits.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that provision in the gentleman's bill will mean the avoidance of a great many difficulties that have been confronted by veterans of the First World War. Is that not true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One of the greatest difficulties they have had in many instances has been the absence of those records. Under the gentleman's bill, before a man left the service he would know where those records were.

Mr. BROOKS. Proceeding to that very point, mentioned by the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of this resolution, the War and Navy Departments are authorized to provide throughout the United States demobilization centers to which these men and women about to be discharged are sent. From the center nearest the home he is given 3 months' furlough with a round-trip ticket to his home. At the end of the 3-month period he is brought back for the final pre-discharge examination. At this time he is allowed to file applications and claims which are desirable. He is given clerical and technical assistance from officers of the Veterans' Administration and is permitted to consult with representatives of service organizations available. The Veterans' Administration is encouraged to process immediately claims and to adjudicate them at the very moment of discharge.

And as the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] has just indicated, during that 3-month period the records of that man or woman are assembled at this one point—the demobilization center.

When he returns from his 3-months' furlough his entire record, including all of his medical record is right there before him. At that particular moment when the final physical examination is completed and he knows the result of it, he can refer to his service record and his medical record. That record is available to the Veterans' Administration representatives. It will be available to representatives of those organizations which aid veterans and which are recognized by the Veterans' Administration. So that this serviceman, before he receives his discharge, will know as far as anyone can know, just what his physical condition may be; and he will then be advised and counseled as to what action he should take in order that his disabilities may be translated into action by the Veterans' Administration that he may be promptly adjudicated a disabled American veteran.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am interested in the fine address the gentleman is making on this very important problem. It is certainly something that this Congress has got to deal with, and of course, the quicker the better. Particularly I was interested in the proposal of the 3-month furlough. Certainly it seems, if practical, that would be very desirable; but I was wondering what the gentleman had in mind with reference to the jurisdiction of that soldier for the 3 months he would be back home. What could he do during that 3-month period? Would he still be a soldier? Would he wear a uniform? Would he be in civilian clothes? Under what jurisdiction, judicially, would he come? There are many problems that would arise.

Mr. BROOKS. Under this bill he would be a furloughed soldier with full authority to pursue all arrangements necessary to reenter civilian life, and to do any kind of work or gainful occupation that he desired during that time, subject only to the obligation at the end of that term to go back and submit to his final physical examination and receive his discharge from the Army or Navy of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Would he be in uniform?

Mr. BROOKS. He could be in uniform or he may not be in uniform, as he so desires.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The gentleman would suggest then that under his proposal, a man could be on furlough and in civilian clothes, and then at the proper time go back into the Army with his uniform on, in order to be mustered out, so to speak?

Mr. BROOKS. The purpose of the bill is to not release a veteran and then lose all interest in him. It is to furlough a soldier for 90 days, and during that time give him all of the aid toward being reemployed, and all of the counsel toward asserting any claim that he might have before the Veterans' Bureau, or any preference that he might have in other agencies of Government. When he is discharged he will be placed back into gainful employment or if he is disabled, he will have his claim recognized promptly by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's proposal. Certainly it seems to me that something along this line is going to be desirable. However, there is one further point. If back home on this 3-month furlough, unfortunately he gets into some trouble of some kind, by action or otherwise, then what would be the jurisdiction?

Mr. BROOKS. This is covered in the provisions in the bill which provide that rules and regulations may be made by the Secretaries of War and Navy covering the situation during the furlough period. It is the intent and purpose of the bill to release that man as far as possible

from the Army, subject only to returning at the end of 90 days for examination and discharge. Criminal matters may, if it is found desirable, for such a limited period, be handled by civil courts as prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Suppose a man is injured while out on furlough; would he then be subject to all the benefits the same as though he were in the service?

Mr. BROOKS. There would be no difference at all just because he had received a furlough; he would still be in the service. A soldier in South America given a 30- or 60-day furlough and told to go home would be in exactly the same situation as the man who reaches the termination of his service in the Army and who is released for 90 days to go home to make arrangements to reenter civilian life. This is very important. We cannot expect, Mr. Speaker, every man who has been away from the United States for over 3 years, as some of these men have, to come back home and expect to sit around the camps after they reach these shores again day after day and week after week, perhaps running into months, so they may be physically examined, may be sent to the hospital and reexamined time and again. They want to get back to the homes and the loved ones from whom they have been away many months. We offer them this furlough of 3 months that they may go home during this time, see their families, make arrangements to reenter civilian life and then come back, and if they are disabled, receive the rights and benefits they are entitled to from the Veterans' Administration.

If the person about to be discharged does not desire to file a claim for a benefit with the Veterans' Administration, he is encouraged to seek the help of the United States Employment Service or the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service Administration for the purpose of obtaining a job back home. These services are directed to have officers available at this time, and the newly made veteran is aided in filling out and filing his application for work at the very moment of discharge.

Mr. Speaker, in the last war, when we were discharged from the armed forces, we were given \$60 and were immediately "placed on our own." The purpose of this bill is to go further than the Nation went with the servicemen in the last war.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to learn of the action of the Veterans' Administration in the establishment of an adjudication unit at Walter Reed Hospital. This, I understand, is to be the beginning of this kind of service, and that if it works all right at Walter Reed Hospital, by agreement with the War Department, the service will be extended to other War Department hospitals throughout the United States. The claims of the disabled men and women may then be studied while they are in the hospital in cases of apparent service-connected disability, and they may begin to receive benefits immediately upon discharge. This action will

not, however, advance the claim of the man or woman who is not in a hospital, but the stipulations of this resolution will give him the aid he badly needs.

Speaking further upon the program the Veterans' Administration has just announced, and it follows along with the general purposes of the resolution I have just introduced, this Administration has established at Walter Reed Hospital an adjudication unit. It is very evident that men who are in the hospital for battle wounds, perhaps the loss of an arm or a leg, with or without their service records are entitled to some award and some adjudication. Under the new program of the Administration when men are in that condition, they may immediately file their claims before discharge in the hospital and submit their case for adjudication and an award of the bureau.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House on the justice and necessity of providing a Federal ballot to enable our gallant soldiers to vote in 1944. The argument for a Federal ballot is a simple and obvious one; those who are fit to fight for America are fit to vote in America. Our fighting men are our No. 1 class, triple-A citizens by virtue of their heroic efforts in defense of this Nation. We must assure these fighting citizens of access to the ballot.

Today I want to call the attention of the House to the complete inadequacy of the existing system for polling our vast soldier vote. As the system stands today, there are 48 separate and distinct sets of requirements, set by the 48 separate States. A mass of red tape stands between the absentee soldier and the ballot box. The boys in the slit trenches of Tarawa and Italy obviously do not have the time to fight their way through this red tape. And if they did have the persistence and time it would still, in most cases, be physically impossible for them to comply with the various State requirements.

Allow me to present some facts which demonstrate the burden placed on the soldier vote by the various State registration requirements. There are 39 States which require that soldiers must register to vote. The only exceptions are the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas. And registration is required in certain parts of both Kansas and Minnesota.

There are 34 States where registration is permanent, but men and women in the armed forces who are just reaching 21 will not have registered and have not had an opportunity to register. The

lowest percentage of registered voters in the United States is the 21- to 30-year-old group, showing that a large number of the soldier citizens of these 34 States have not achieved the permanently registered status.

There are nearly as many variations of registration requirements as there are States. In California, Connecticut, and Montana notice of service in the armed forces does not serve to continue registration after failure to vote. I understand that in Louisiana it is necessary to reregister every 4 years unless service in the armed forces is known. Registration is not permanent in certain localities in Missouri and Nebraska and is permanent in others. In New York the execution of a war-voter's oath in signing an absentee ballot constitutes registration.

I have been told that absentee soldiers are not allowed to register in New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming, and sections of Nebraska. New Jersey is the only State mentioned above whose legislature meets in 1944. All other States would have to call special sessions of their legislatures in order to write new laws, or in some cases, institute constitutional amendments to change their absentee-voting machinery for 1944.

These facts show the failure of our existing soldier-voting machinery. I submit that it is obvious that we must correct this failure with an efficient uniform Federal ballot which will allow our fighting men to vote to assure them the triple-A grade of citizenship they are defending.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by providing insurance benefits in the amount of \$5,000 for the parents, regardless of dependency, of those persons in active service who died in line of duty after October 8, 1940, and before April 20, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1941, we enacted Public Law No. 360 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Under this act automatic insurance benefits were provided for any person who was killed in line of duty on and after October 8, 1940, and within 120 days after the date of the enactment of said bill, which would be April 20, 1942. These benefits, in the amount of \$5,000 are payable to the following beneficiaries and in the order named:

(A) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried.

(B) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

(C) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

Under the bill I have introduced I am striking the word "dependent" as it applies to the mother or father of the insured soldier. It is the purpose of my bill to pay to the parents of every boy losing his life during this period the sum of \$5,000, irrespective of dependency.

I feel that this is the least that we can do for these parents. Many of these boys were just out of school and had never been in a position to contribute to the support of their parents. It is impossible in most cases for any degree of dependency to be established. I think it is unjust and unfair to ask these parents to make such a showing. It is calling upon them to stultify themselves by taking a mercenary attitude, which they refuse to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that this Congress can do that will compensate these parents for the loss of their sons. We have been very liberal in this war in the matter of payments and benefits to our soldiers. I think it is only fair that we should extend this same consideration to these parents. The payment of \$5,000 can only be a slight token of our appreciation for the costly sacrifice that they have laid upon the altar of freedom.

I am informed that a large number of these cases have accumulated in the Veterans' Administration. Under the present law no payment of benefits can be made unless dependency can be established. These parents had no thought of any financial gain when their sons entered the service, many by enlistment. No thought was given to insurance, as at that time we were at peace, and war was considered improbable. I think this Congress now has an opportunity to express its gratitude by making these benefits available in all cases where boys have given up their lives in the defense of their country without having in force the insurance provided for under the War Risk Insurance Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. KENNEDY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. PACE (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK), for the remainder of this week, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMASON (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for rest of this week, on account of important official business with the War Department as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

To Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for 1 day, on account of attending a funeral.

To Mr. SASSCER (at the request of Mr. WARD), for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 2 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made;

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Russell and Winifred Russell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; and

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3805. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by providing insurance benefits, regardless of dependency, for the parents and other relatives

of those persons in active service who died in line of duty after October 8, 1940, and before April 20, 1942, without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3806. A bill authorizing the appointment of morticians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3807. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3808. A bill to increase allowances for clerk hire in post offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3809. A bill providing for classification of clerks in third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 3810. A bill to provide for the suspension of the point-rationing system with respect to meat for 60 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRACHT:

H. R. 3811. A bill to protect classified civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3812 (by request). A bill to authorize suits for benefits claimed to be payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. J. Res. 204. A joint resolution to provide an orderly method of demobilization for members of the armed services of the United States; to aid in obtaining suitable employment for such persons; to provide an orderly method for speeding up and handling of claims and applications; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. Res. 375. A resolution requesting certain information from the Attorney General on the authority for transferring to the War Food Administrator certain duties placed by statute upon the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3814. A bill for the relief of M. Senders & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3815. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 3816. A bill for the relief of Walter Acker, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3959. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of Anna M. Lakin and 21 other residents of Kahoka, Mo., requesting the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks the enactment of prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3960. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of J. A. Austin and 19 other citizens of Fruita, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3961. Also, petition of Vernon V. Blosser and 25 other citizens of New Lebanon, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3962. Also, petition of Bertha Bovair and 17 other citizens of Glens Falls, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3963. Also, petition of Rev. Alfred Gilberg and 61 other citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3964. Also, petition of Mrs. Jean E. Moffatt and 40 other citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3965. Also, petition of Leona B. Clarke and 33 other citizens of Merced, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3966. Also, petition of Rev. Charles D. Patterson and 147 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3967. Also, petition of Ellman C. Ott and 46 other citizens of Fairmount, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3968. Also, petition of Marian Mann and 47 other citizens of Lockport, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3969. Also, petition of David Ginder and 194 other citizens of Middletown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3970. Also, petition of Bertha P. Finn and 20 other citizens of Hatboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3971. Also, petition of Marcum B. May and 68 other citizens of Barker, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3972. Also, petition of Rev. L. G. Armbrust and 86 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3973. Also, petition of R. F. Mumford and 40 other citizens of Arago, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3974. Also, petition of Delmar D. Yocum and 35 other citizens of Bynumville, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3975. Also, petition of Mrs. C. N. Lorham and 34 other citizens of Culesac, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3976. Also, petition of D. E. Shumaker and 32 other citizens of St. Johns, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3977. Also, petition of Mrs. Malcolm Gustafson and 21 other citizens of Albert

City, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3978. Also, petition of Florence P. Cook and 40 other citizens of West Chester, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3979. Also, petition of Mrs. W. S. Wait and 22 other citizens of Perkins, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3980. By Mr. CASE: Petition of John Adams, secretary of South Dakota Implement Dealers Association, urging promotion and development of a Missouri River project for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3981. Also, petition of the council on war and post-war problems, of the University of South Dakota, signed by Dean Marshall McKusick, chairman; R. F. Patterson, secretary; and Dr. I. D. Weeks, president of the University of South Dakota, urging promotion and development of a Missouri River project for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3982. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of the railway employees in Quincy, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 3396; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3983. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Emelia Erickson, Alma Erickson, and 28 other citizens of Thief River Falls, Minn., advocating the passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, and/or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3984. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of the members of Lodge No. 444, International Association of Machinists of Sioux City, Iowa, urging support of House Joint Resolution 187; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3985. By Mr. KING: Petition of Thaddeus F. Olk, of Los Angeles, Calif., signed by 235 constituents, stating that food subsidies as outlined by the President are absolutely essential in holding food prices in check and averting inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3986. Also, petition of members of the Brethren Church of Hermosa Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Royal D. Glick is pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3987. Also, petition of I. J. Spencer, of Redondo Beach, Calif., and signed by members of the Congregational Church of Redondo Beach, of which Rev. Charles Thomas is pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3988. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Association of Western State Engineers, adopted at Denver, Colo., October 25-26, 1943,

relative to maintenance of stream gaging under the adopted policy of equal participation by the States and the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3989. Also, resolution of the Ninety-first Division Association of San Francisco, Calif., requesting that action be taken to remove the restrictions imposed by the Department of Agriculture on the growing of tobacco, and that the Department of Agriculture revise all quotas on the growing of tobacco for the manufacture of cigarettes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3990. Also, resolution of the Philippine Society of California, San Francisco, relative to remitting all charges for transportation and living expenses en route of all American repatriates returning from countries held by the enemy and where their financial resources are frozen, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3991. Also, resolution of the San Francisco Chapter, No. 3, Disabled American Veterans, dated November 4, 1943, requesting that action be taken to remove the restrictions imposed by the Department of Agriculture on manufacturers of tobacco products, including cigarettes, and, further, that the lend-lease program be restricted to a degree where it will have the use only of such surplus tobacco products and cigarettes as may be available after our armed forces have been fully and adequately supplied; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3992. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others, of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3993. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, relative to subsidies and price-control policies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3994. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 7, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead, Thou bringest forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgment as the noonday. Cause us to hear Thy loving kindness in the morning, for in Thee do we trust.

Upon our spirits as we come today there rests the sadness of farewell at the sudden passing from our side and sight of a loved figure, who for so many years bowed in reverence here at the hour of the morning prayer and in whose thoughts daily was the ministry of the petitions here offered to those whose

lives they might touch across this broad land. We thank Thee for the life and service of this servant of Thine and of the Nation, who wore ever the white flower of a blameless life; whose personal bearing stamped him as one of Thy noblemen, whose gentleness made him great, whose rare qualities of heart and mind endeared him to the Members of this body and whose very countenance was as a parchment of peace. In this temple of freedom whose courts he had trod with joyful fidelity for threescore and six years, seeing and recording the moving pageant of the Nation's life, he has lingered until the light of a coming victory over the tyranny which threatened us and all the world reddens the sky. And now, as aged Simeon of old, he has fallen on sleep at his post of service with the parting benediction, "Now lettest Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." We pray that Thou wilt pour the benediction of Thy consolation upon his dear ones who sit today in the bowed circle of grief. Bring us all to the homeland of Thine eternal love and to the inheritance of the saints in light. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces on October 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON SEVERAL AGENCIES—EXPENDITURES FOR TRAVEL, PRINTING AND BINDING, AND PURCHASE OF MOTOR-PROPELLED PASSENGER-CARRYING VEHICLES

A letter from the Director of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters addressed to the heads of the Division of Central Administrative Services, Foreign Economic Administration, National War Labor